

# **Evangelical Handbook,**

in which

**it is irrefutably proved from certain sacred Scriptures,  
how the said Lutheran faith is rightly catholic, but the  
papal doctrine is fundamentally erroneous and  
contrary to the Holy Word of God.**

**To save the heavenly truth,**

for the instruction of the simple,  
and of Christians who are in the Papacy,

prepared

by

**Matthias Hoë von Hoënegg,**

Court Preacher for the Elector of Saxony at Dresden.

**With a preface**

of the venerable theological faculty in Leipzig.

**Printed in Leipzig**

in the year 1603.

Second edition.

**Dresden,**

Justus Naumann's bookstore.

**(Heinrich Naumann.)**

St. Louis, Mo.: M. C. Barthel.

## [Table of Contents]

	page
<a href="#"><u>Preface — Matthias Höe</u></a>	1
<a href="#"><u>Preface — Leipzig Faculty: To the Christian Reader</u></a>	7
<a href="#"><u>Preface — Balduin's salute</u></a>	10
Article	page
1: <a href="#"><u>Of the Holy Scriptures</u></a>	11
2: <a href="#"><u>Of the Church</u></a>	17
3: <a href="#"><u>Of Justification</u></a>	33
4: <a href="#"><u>Of the invocation of the saints</u></a>	49
5: <a href="#"><u>Of the Sacraments</u></a>	58
6: <a href="#"><u>Of the Holy Supper</u></a>	63
7: <a href="#"><u>On Reserving, Enclosing, Adoration of the Sacrament</u></a>	68
8: <a href="#"><u>On the Feast of Corpus Christi</u></a>	71
9: <a href="#"><u>Of the Mass</u></a>	74
10: <a href="#"><u>Of One or Both kinds in the Holy Sacrament of the Altar</u></a>	85
11: <a href="#"><u>On Sacrificing and Praying for the Dead</u></a>	96
12: <a href="#"><u>Of Purgatory</u></a>	102
13: <a href="#"><u>Of Celibacy or Priestly Marriage</u></a>	116
14: <a href="#"><u>Of the Roman Pope and thus of the Antichrist</u></a>	127
<a href="#"><u>I. First part: What does Pope want to be: Universal head</u></a>	128
<a href="#"><u>II. Second part: What does the Pope not want to be: Antichrist</u></a>	137
<a href="#"><u>Luther's Open Letter on Translating "Alone" in Rom. 3:28</u></a>	142

# To those well-born, [\[ToC\]](#)

noble and prudent lords, gentlemen of both laudable estates, of lords and knighthood, of the Augsburg Confession in Austria, below and above the [river Ens](#) etc.

To my gracious, generous and commanding lords,

I wish from God the Father right constant  
faith, gracious comfort and protection in body and soul,  
through Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit. Amen.

**W**ellborn, noble, prudent, gracious and most favorable lords. This last hour in which we live is truly the end of the world, and is such as our Head and only Savior Jesus Christ has foretold, that so much confusion and apostasy will take place that, if it were possible, even the elect would be deceived. I will not speak of other sectarians, of devilish revolters, of Sacramentarians and Zwinglians, who lead many thousands of souls astray and away from the true faith, but only of the new whitewashers and builders of the invaded and overthrown papacy. Everyone knows with what incessant endeavors, with what incessant thinking, they have undertaken to bring about their false doctrine from time to time, but to dampen, eradicate and extinguish our apostolic doctrine: Not only with treachery, deceit, with secret practices, with public violence, but with books, with tracts, with sermons, which are of such a nature that only their opinions are expressed therein, but many lies are introduced to us and the eyes of the simple are blurred. In particular, they use these tricks to pretend that: 1. our doctrine is new, barely 80 years old, but theirs is old and many hundreds of years older than ours. 2. They persuade the people that one must not only go to the saving Word of God, to the voice of the Arch-Shepherd of Jesus Christ, to the prophetic and apostolic books, because they are too imperfect, too dark and too obscure to correctly indicate or discuss the articles of faith. Instead, one should let the Church, namely the Roman Church, or, as they said at the Colloquy at Regensburg, let the Roman Pope make the pronouncement and stick to his decrees, words and statutes, and not think anything against them, speak nothing, hear nothing, much less doubt their certainty. So if Christians are quick to believe everything they say as a gospel book, it is no wonder that so many souls are deceived and led astray. But if some people would think about it properly and seek advice from others as to whether it is true, as the opponents claim, they would undoubtedly receive a better report and be saved from *Apostasia* (apostasy).

For first of all they would learn how it is nothing new that the right, pure doctrine has been proclaimed as new, but that this imposition was also

encountered by the people of God in the Old Testament and by the apostles in the New Testament. In the book of Esther, chapter 3, Haman comes to *Ahasuerus* and says: The people of God have another law than the law of all other nations: they are a new sectarian rabble, since it is obvious that they [**Haman's people**] had the oldest word of God. Since St. Paul preached at Athens about the crucified Jesus, whom we also preach with one accord and to all, knowing nothing but Jesus Christ the crucified, the scholars were quick to say: "It seems as if he wanted to proclaim new gods, yes, he drove him to a place of execution and said: Can we also know what new doctrine you are teaching, for you are bringing something new to our ears? St. Paul must be teaching a new doctrine, since he neither spoke nor preached anything except what was written in the prophets. And as it is with us today, that we are cried out in Rome as new damned heretics, so it was with St. Paul in Rome, where the Jews, who wanted to be far from the catholic Church, boasted of their antiquity, their succession, their fathers, the miracles that had happened among them, called his teaching such a sect, *haeresin*, heresy, which was contradicted at all ends. So it was with the right ancient Christian faith at *Caesarea*, where the preaching of the Lord Jesus, a sect of the Nazarenes and a shameful heresy for the governor *Felice* himself, had to be blasphemed. And in sum, it was so mean that, as Eusebius writes, for a long time the Christian faith was called nothing other than *novam & peregrinam*, a new and strange faith. But as little as such blasphemy does not harm the doctrine of St. Paul, so little does it harm our *confession* if it is proclaimed as a new doctrine. The devil will not let go of his ways, as he did in the days of the apostles: what would he not do now? Let us beware of the deed, the lies will be well advised. For by the grace of God we are always ready and willing to demonstrate to everyone that our doctrine is precisely that which is written in the ancient prophetic and apostolic writings. We have also proved it in this booklet with sound reason. Therefore the Holy Spirit, when he pointed out the highly enlightened holy man of God, LUTHER, and gave an account of his teaching, called it an eternal gospel and *intituliret* (designated it) in the fourteenth chapter of the Revelation of John. [**Rev. 14:6**]

And it is not enough that the opposition party glosses their doctrine with *antiquity* and age, since not the old, but the very oldest faith is right, and that what has been for a long time or has lasted a long time is not immediately considered good, otherwise the golden calves of Jeroboam in Dan and Bethel would also have been good, which have lasted for a long time. Likewise the worship of Baal with its camarim and priests. The other pagan idols Astaroth, Chamos, Moloch, Gad, Meni, etc., all of which lasted a long time. And the Jewish Talmud would be much better than the Council of Trent, because the former [**Talmud**] is now more than a thousand and five and a half hundred years old, while the latter has been in existence for barely fifty years. Thus one would as soon be a Jew as a pope, if he would only look at mere age.

Therefore, we do not deny that the papal doctrine is ancient, but we are content to know that it is not the most

ancient, that it is not the ancient prophetic and apostolic doctrine. For this *antiquity* (*antiquitas*) is right and valid before the judgment seat of Jesus Christ, when we say: Lord, thus did the prophets, thus did the apostles, yes, thus did you preach from earth in paradise and after you became man: that through your name all who believe in you will receive forgiveness of sins. In this way we follow the commandment which our Lord God has given us in Jeremiah the prophet, when he says: "Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." But what are these old and good ways? They are the refined words of the Lord, the word and testimony of God. For God has shown us the right way and the right path. Just as the enemies themselves, convinced in their conscience, must confess.

Otherwise, if people wanted to follow the old ways of their fathers, which were not good even if they were of the same age, God said: *In praeceptis meis ambulate, non in praeceptis Patrum vestrorum*. Walk in my commandments and not in the commandments of your fathers. Let the old one come out of your mouth. And Christ opposed his teaching to the teaching of the elders, Matthew 5 [Matt. 5:21-22], saying, "Ye have heard that it was said of them of old time, Thou shalt not kill... But I say unto you...". Matthew 15 is a particularly good example of such a disputation. For there came to Jesus the scribes and Pharisees of Jerusalem, who were the most noble, no different than when the Popes and Cardinals come today, and say to Christ, "Why do your disciples transgress the ordinances of the elders? They do not wash their hands when they eat bread". Jesus answers them: "Why then do you transgress God's commandment for the sake of your own ordinances?" It is clear then that the Lord Jesus considers the commandments of God to be the right way to go, rather than the rulings of the elders. Just as He soon afterward makes the statement in vain: "In vain do they serve me, because they teach such doctrines as are nothing but commandments of men. All plants that my heavenly Father has not planted will be cut down. Let them go, they are blind and blind leaders." For this reason the Jesuits should not only make great claims that their doctrine is old, but prove that it is such an old doctrine, which the *Antiquus dierum*, the Eternal God in Paradise, planted through the patriarchs, prophets and apostles. But it should be difficult for them to do so. I believe it shall remain until the Last Day. That would be one thing.

Secondly, whether we Christians do right in basing our faith on the Word of the Most High is not much of a question. I know what St. Paul says: faith comes from hearing, but hearing comes from the Word of God. Neither the Pope nor the Roman Church is the basis of faith, but the Word of God. Oh, we should grasp it with our hands that we can and should believe God's infallible Word more than the word of men. Who is the Pope? Is he not a man? Now all men are liars, Psalm 116, and especially the popes, as their histories testify.

Where do we have our eyes and our minds? We see and know that the popes have fabricated abominable heresies, that they have denied the resurrection of the dead, that they have committed terrible incest, that they have painted pictures, that they have trampled on the heads of the high authorities,

persecuted them, sought their life and limb, robbed them of their honor and dignity by force, took most of the money from the Roman empire by means of simony (*symoney*) and incessant avarice, as the histories all testify and the laudable Roman emperors themselves have complained about them: Nevertheless we will believe them, we will trust them, we will accept their word and decree. What will God say to us on that Day? Who has pointed us to his Son Jesus and commanded us to listen to him, not the pope? What will Jesus Christ say, who pointed us to the Word and the Scriptures in the same way, John 5, when He said: "Search the Scriptures." And commanded His disciples to teach what He commanded them, Matt. 28. Let us think of the words of God in Isaiah 8:20: "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." And in Deuteronomy in the 4th and 12th chapters [Deut. 12:32]: "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." These words should always ring and resound in our ears. For if the adversaries say that the Scriptures are not perfect for the study of the faith, the Pope and the Church must also add to them. So I ask them for God's sake. You answer this question: Did not the first pope and the first church take their faith from Scripture? If they say yes, the question is, why do they not stick to the Scriptures now? And if then the Scriptures were sufficiently clear and perfect for them to take faith from them, why should the Scriptures not be so clear and perfect now? Give this as your reply to the Jesuits. But it is blasphemous to hear that the Word of the Most High God is not perfect, not good enough, unless the pope adds something to it.

O Lord God, have you been so incomprehensible or so merciless that you have not been able or willing to indicate what belongs to the perfection of Scripture until the Pope, the Antichrist, comes? Or have you become so changeable that you declare in your Word that no one should do anything about your word, and yet the pope should have power to do much about it, much of it? Far be it from us that we should think you so incomprehensible, unmerciful and changeable. With what conscience can we listen to the pope apart from and without the clear and bright Word of God? That can be compared neither with God's wisdom, nor his mercy, nor his truth.

That is why we stick to the Word of God as the best foundation and reason. We hear Moses and the prophets, Christ Jesus, the apostles, we follow no stranger, but cling firmly to the voice of our arch-shepherd Jesus Christ, the comforting certain hope: Whoever hears him (even if he does not hear the pope) shall not be put to shame.

Now if many of them would ponder these things in the fear of the Lord, and search carefully what doctrine agrees with the Word of God, some would not fall away as quickly and recklessly as the ripe fruit of trees, denying the recognized truth, swaying and blowing with every wind.

But so that those in particular who live in the papacy may have a guide to examine and recognize our doctrine and that of the popes, I have, out of Christian love, not omitted but

wanted to share this little book with them, in which, with clear reasons from Holy Scripture, our pure doctrine is confirmed and the errors to the contrary are refuted. I have also humbly invoked the Holy Spirit to grant grace that this work may flourish in His honor and for the good of many Christians. No doubt He will hear and answer my prayer that this work will not be in vain in the Lord. If only we do not plug our ears and harden our hearts, then the Word of the Lord can bear fruit and bring benefit.

However, Your Gracious and Dutiful Sirs, I humbly wish to attribute and dedicate such my minor work in public print for the following reasons:

For first of all, as a child of Austria, I recognize myself a debtor to serving the Austrian country to the utmost of my ability, in which I was born and educated, since I also have my (without glory to report) honest, respectable friendship, of which many are distinguished members, both in the laudable gentleman's and knight's estate, especially in Lower Austria.

Although the most high and the highest authorities, the most gracious Roman Emperor and the most gracious Archdukes, I well remember what was said by their Roman imperial Majesty and Princes, Highnesses have shown me friendship in many ways, for which reason their Roman Imperial Majesty and Most Gracious Archdukes have also shown me great favor. I am the most humble debtor for the rest of my life. And even though I am otherwise able to render little service to the most exalted and most gracious of my most gracious masters, I am nevertheless in the habit of praying with diligence and, without glorying, with the most humble humility for their temporal and eternal welfare, asking Almighty God to rule these high sovereigns with his Holy Spirit, to grace them with all temporal and eternal, bodily and spiritual welfare, through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.

Most gracious lords, but, even if I may be of little use otherwise, nevertheless, since I am aware that my Most gracious lords take gracious pleasure in such little books, from which they see reasons for their catholic faith, as their zeal in the pure unadulterated Augsburg Confession is richly known, so I have, as it were, herewith endeavored to be of some use to my lords., since my lords are also reasonably regarded as *patres patriae*, as fathers of the fatherland. G. and G. to be useful and agreeable to a certain extent, especially since E. Gn. and G. are also fairly regarded as *patres patriae*, fathers of the fatherland, to whom I also owe my obedience and gratitude.

The wise pagan Cicero said: *Si contentio quedam & comparatio fiat, quibus, plurimum tribuendum sit officii, Principes sunt Patria & parentes, quorum beneficiis obligati sumus.* That is: If one wants to think rightly, to whom one should render the most service, it will certainly be found that such is due primarily and above all to the fatherland and the parents, to whom we are justly obliged to serve because of good deeds received.

In order to fulfill this duty to a certain extent, I have herewith obediently offered and inscribed this booklet to Your Grace and Your Grace, requesting that Your Grace and Your Grace will make a note of it in your grace and favor, and let me be at your command.

May the almighty God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve the praiseworthy land of Austria for a long time, granting it peace, unity,

spiritual and physical welfare. May He protect our most gracious lord the Roman Emperor, our most gracious princes the archdukes, so that the praiseworthy estates among them may lead a peaceful and quiet life in all godliness and honor. May the pious God stand by E. G. and G. with his mercy, and may he restrain and ward off all heresies, sects and loose doctrines of the Antichrist, the Zwinglians, the Anabaptists, the Flaccians and others, and keep us all in the truth, for his word is the truth. And let him do this for the sake of his dear Son Jesus Christ, our only atoning sinner and Savior, Amen, amen, in the name of Jesus Christ, Amen. Written at Dresden, August 12, 1603.

Venerable Grace,

Your diligent servant  
at all times,

***Matthias Höe.***



# To the Christian reader. [ToC](#)

John, the evangelist and apostle of Christ, was shown many pictures and visions in the Spirit of the state of the churches of God in the New Testament, how they experienced great tribulation and persecution from all kinds of tyrants and heretics, and especially from the two antichrists, but were to be mightily comforted by the revelation of the Holy Gospel and the fall of the Antichrist.

Among others, he saw seven angels clothed in pure linen and girded with golden girdles on their breasts, who poured out the vials of God's wrath on the earth, for one of them, the sixth angel in number, poured out his vial on the great river Euphrates, from which it dried up and the way was prepared for the kings from the going out of the sun.

According to this John saw three unclean spirits like frogs coming out of the mouth of the dragon, the beast and the false prophet, whom the evangelist calls the spirits of devils, who perform signs and go out to the kings of the earth and to the whole world to gather them into battle for that great day of God the Almighty. As it is written in the book of Revelation on the 16th.

The meaning of this vision will not now require much research or discussion, as the fulfillment is now in the day and the work speaks for all the world itself. For after the great Babel of the Roman Antichrist had stood for a long time in prosperity and stretched his head out over all the kingdoms, power and goods of all Christendom, God, out of but grace and causeless goodness and mercy, raised up in the last times a preaching angel [[Rev. 14:6](#)], the noble and worthy man Dr. *Martinum Lutherum*, who out of divine zeal, with great earnestness and strong emphasis, greater than eighty years ago, the Pope's indulgences, simony and drudgery, through which the new Babel, no less than the old, on the ship-rich waters of the *Euphrates* of all the world's goods, were brought, as it were, burden by burden from all lands, this Luther by and with God's Word, so hindered and brought down such in Germany and many other lands and kingdoms, and the supply escaped him, also otherwise the Roman Babel has noticeably fallen and destroyed.

But the seven-headed crowned beast, who received from the infernal dragon his power, his throne and great authority to avenge this damage, has given forth from his mouth unclean spirits, like frogs, which are spirits of devils, namely the perverse sophists, inquisitors and heretic masters, ambassadors and advocates of the Roman See, all kinds of orders and races. But especially notable are the Jesuit rabble, who spread into all countries and enlist kings, princes and potentates to embitter them with terrible lies and diabolical blasphemies against the Gospel, also with a false semblance of their own holiness and vaunted signs (of whose clientele there is no closer to recovery than from the new India) they

and with their frog cries proclaim and reflect the apostolic truth as the worst heresy and doctrine of the devil in writing and orally for all the world, as their poisonously innumerable books sufficiently testify, especially *Censura Coloniensis*, *Harmonia Andreae Fabricii Leodii*, and the falsely named *Francisci Burchardi Antonomia*, and what such Jebusite fruits and poems are more, as well as the manifold and rapid practices that have been carried out in many places by Jebusite bloodhounds for the promotion and introduction of the Spanish Inquisition, examples of which, if they were to be narrated and introduced from the beginning of the re-revealed light of the Holy Gospel, would probably fill quite a few large books.

And indeed, as far as the knightly heroic deeds (according to their Livonian beginning and origin) of the Jesuit Order in particular are concerned, as incitements of the countries, incitements against the Protestants or, since one does not want to dance to their tune, with foundations of mayhem and murder against royal and princely persons, etc., these are to be found from the glorious testimonies and proclamations that these honorable societies of France, England, Sweden, Transylvania and other places. These are to be documented from the splendid *testimonies* and proclamations obtained by these honest societies in France, England, Sweden, Transylvania and other places, in masses issued to them together with the passports (to be reported with leave) in open print, also several oaths to honor their beautiful deeds, and erected in *perpetuam rerum praeclare, scilicet, gestarum memoriam in publico*, from which it can be manfully determined how and why they, as useless, restless and incendiary frogs, have been shown the window of opportunity to seek other ground and to make their cries and spittle in other puddles, which Kühfenster has shown.

But that in many other places this rabble has the best of luck and right, and that in high and low places they enlist rulers to disrupt the good police, and even to ruin the country and the people, enriching their order with finances and the miraculous acquisition of large pensions and incomes, and wants to have the dominion (*Dominium*) everywhere alone, and in sum so close to home that even their own faithful openly complain of the same arrogance, defiance and sacrilege in open writings, that must be put in its place and ordered by God and the times.

And because without the clay and dung of the falsely named clergy in the land of worldly rulers between the iron toes, the day of final redemption will be awaited with sighing and patience, when the stone without hands will tear itself off the mountain, crush clay and iron, and after the abolition of the earthly dilapidated regimes, establish its eternal kingdom among its elect.

But if it behooves evangelical preachers to discover the Roman Babel and its abominations, to muzzle the antichristian frogs who blaspheme the divine truth of the only saving Gospel with their useless cries, to comfort the oppressed and persecuted who have been greatly distressed by their incitement in the Babylonian prison and tribulation, to teach the weak and misguided and to urge them back onto the right path of truth and to strengthen them in the faith Christianly and well done, as if such things were done differently by faithful teachers in these

lands and elsewhere, since they confidently poured their bowls into the Euphrates of the Roman Babel.

And because the present booklet by the venerable and highly learned Matthiäs Höe, court preacher at the Saxon court in Dresden, has been prepared for this purpose and the most noble articles about which the evangelical churches and their confession are contested and condemned by the Papists, have been correctly and well explained by him and the opponents' false arguments have been clearly refuted, in the end simple-minded Christians who are in danger and would be misled by seductive Jesuit and apostate guides, and misled by seductive Jesuitical and apostolic signposts and would be deceived by something of the truth, to find their way again and to stand firm in the truth of the Gospel, we have certainly accepted his well-meant faithful work, approve it with our consent and testimony (*Consens* and *Testimonio*) and wish to commend it to the Christian reader, not doubting that by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ it will not go without special benefit and fruit for the Church of God.

May the Almighty, eternal, merciful God defeat all enemies of the holy Gospel, keep us in His Word and thereby save us eternally for the sake of Jesus Christ, his most beloved and only begotten Son, Amen. *Scriptum Lipsiae* (Leipzig), *September 17. Anno 1603.*

*Dean, Elder, & Doctors  
of the Theological  
Faculty there.*

*Ad Reverendum, Nobilem, clariss. virum [ToC](#)*

**D. MATTHIAM HOE,  
SS. THEOLOGIAE L.  
ET ECCLESIASTEM IN AULA  
Dresdensi, amicum atque fratrem meum in domino  
honorandum.**

*Nemini adulari, nee adusta voluere fauce  
Pulpamenta; palam si jubeare loqui;  
Sed tacitos aperire animos, calamoque ministro  
Dogmata ad Antaecos spargere, Antipodas:  
Hoc quoque Theologi est: pereat, quicunque fatetur  
Ore, quod occulto pectore forte negat,  
Et pereat, quicunque fidem, quam corde recepit.  
Non audet pleno planius ore loqui.  
Carum atramentum est, quod non subscribat aperte,  
Cui subscripserunt sanguine mille alii.  
Rara sed haec avis est: jam religionis in arce  
Dissimulata fides simulata sedet.  
Sed bene te! MATTHIA, animam cui CHRISTIAS ALTER  
Credidit, ac aulae patria sacra suae:  
Non itate mollem fecit natura, vel usus,  
Unius ad rictus ut moveare lupi.  
Frendeat, pandum os distorqueat Häeresis, at tu  
Detegis haeretici pectoris affanias,  
Ostendisque, nigris quid distent aerua lupinis,  
Pontificumque sacris sacra verenda Dei.  
Prodeat ergo liber: quid debita publica differs:  
Non tuus est, quamvis sit tuus, iste labor.  
Hunc sibi jam laceros Ecclesia passa capillos  
Vendicat, cari pignoris instar habet.  
Perge, nec impensae despera praemia curae;  
Hinc erit famae pars oritura tuae.*

**M. Fridericas Balduinus,**

Dresdensis, Eccl. Friberg.  
ad D. Pet. Minister.

In the name of God the Father,  
of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, Amen.

The first article. [ToC](#)  
Of the Holy Scriptures.

How should one study, teach and learn the true faith?

From some sacred canonical Scriptures contained in prophetic and apostolic books. For thus it is written in the eighth chapter of Isaiah: **According to the law and the testimony, if they do not say this, they will not have the dawn.** For this reason Christ also says in the fifth chapter of the Gospel of John: **Search the Scriptures, for you think that you have eternal life in them, and it is they which testify of me, and you do not want to come to me that you may have life.**

But what should we use to discuss the dispute in the church?

Also from certain sacred canonical Scriptures. For it is certain beyond all doubt that God's Word judges and decides the words of men. Now the Scriptures were not produced by human will, but inspired by God and the Holy Spirit, 2 Peter 1, 2 Timothy 3. Therefore Paul says in Galatians 6:16, **Peace and mercy be upon them, as many as walk according to this rule. Will the Word of God also be judge in that day,** as Christ, John 12, and Paul in Romans 2

clearly say: How much more will it be able to judge and decide the contentious parties in this world? Therefore Christ Jesus also discussed all controversial points against the Pharisees and Sadducees, concerning his divinity, the law and the like, solely from the Scriptures, as can be read in Luke 10, Matthew 19 and 21. Indeed, since the Lord Jesus Christ had to argue with the most hostile adversary, the wicked devil himself, he did not want to deal with him in any other way than with the Scriptures, with the Word of God, through which he also obtained the victory against the devil, Matt. 4. The holy apostles also did this by not only proving their doctrine from the Holy Scriptures, but also by discussing the disputes that had occurred from the prophets. Thus Stephen protects himself, against his enemies, from the Scriptures, Act. 6 and 7. Thus St. Paul appeals to the law and the prophets, Act. 24, 25, and 26. And since he defends the article of justification against the false apostles, also, of the resurrection, he does so from Scripture, as can be seen in his epistle to the Romans, chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, and 10, to the Galatians chapters 2, 3, and 4, and in 1 Corinthians 15. Here also belongs the beautiful little passage from the epistle to the Hebrews in **chapter 4, [Heb. 4:12] The Word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of marrow and bones. And is a judge of the thoughts and intents of the heart.**

Is it not allowed to base an article [**of faith**], or to make decisions, on traditions and statutes of men?

By no means: For thus says God by the prophet Isaiah in chapter 29, and Christ repeats it in Matthew 15 [**:9**]. **They serve me in vain, because they teach such doctrine, which is nothing but the commandment of men.** And again Christ says: **Every plant that my heavenly Father does not plant will be uprooted.** [**Matthew 15:13**] St. Paul writes to the Colossians in the second chapter [**Colossians 2:20**]: **"If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances?**

But how can I learn faith from the Scriptures if the Scriptures are dark?

The Scriptures are bright, clear, and understandable enough in matters of faith, not dark, as the unbelieving and

new-believing papists pretend. David says in Psalm 19 [:8]: **The commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes.** In the 119th Psalm [:105]: **Thy word is a lamp unto my feet.** Solomon writes in the 6th chapter of Proverbs [:23]: **The commandment is a lamp, and the law a light.** See Peter in the 2nd epistle in chapter 1 [:19]: **We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place.** In these testimonies it is clearly stated that the Scriptures are light and not dark. **But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, in whom the god of this world (that is, Satan) has blinded the minds of unbelievers, so that they do not see the bright light of the gospel, the clarity of Christ, as St. Paul testifies with these quoted words in the 2nd epistle to the Corinthians in chapter 4.**

Nevertheless, St. Peter himself confesses that some things in St. Paul's letters are difficult?

No one disputes this. It is not a question of whether certain things, certain persons, are difficult to understand in Scripture, as they are for the godless Jews and other willful heretics, but whether all the articles of faith in Scripture are so difficult to find according to the letter for pious Christians that one cannot know what to conclude from them or actually believe. St. Peter does not say this, but tells me differently: **There are some things in St. Paul's writings that are difficult to understand for those who confuse them, as the unlearned and reckless, as well as other writings to their own condemnation, 2 Pet. 3 [:16], and therefore the popes have nothing to help themselves with this passage of St. Peter.**

They further add that the Scriptures are not perfect, therefore one cannot remain with the Scriptures alone in matters of faith?

Their pretensions are vain and completely contrary to divine truth. The holy apostle Paul says much differently, in his 2nd epistle to Timothy in chapter 3 [:16], with these words: **All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: 17 That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.**

David says in the 19th Psalm [:7]: *Lex Domini PERFECTA*, **the law of the Lord is perfect**. And all the Christian fathers have at all times accepted as known what a man needs to believe and to know, that it is all contained in the revealed Word of God, which contains all God's counsel concerning our salvation. Therefore Paul says in the 20th chapter of the Apostolic Histories [Acts 20:27]: **I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God**. And John confesses that his gospel is so perfect that one can draw from it the right faith in Jesus, and through such faith have eternal life: John 20 [:31] **This is written so that you may believe that Jesus is Christ, the Son of God, and that through faith you may have eternal life**.

Tell Christ John on the 16th I still have much to tell you but you cannot bear it now. But when the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, comes, he will guide you into all truth. Is there still something to be expected from the Holy Spirit that has not been said before?

This passage of the Lord Jesus Christ does not prove that the Scriptures are imperfect, but this much can be concluded from it: Christ did not want to tell the disciples more before they received the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, because he did not understand them. But afterwards, on the day of Pentecost, he sent them the Holy Spirit, who led and guided them into all truth. At that time the apostles still had more to wait for, according to the promise of Christ, namely, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on them. But it does not follow from this that we do not now have perfect Scripture, or that all the articles of faith are not contained in Scripture. A child of ten years of age can understand, and therefore this is without need to speak further of it.

Isn't the descent of Jesus Christ into hell an article of faith, but it cannot be proven from Scripture?

Although the clumsy Jesuits are under the impression that Christ's descent into hell could not be proven from Scripture, the contradiction is in evidence. For in various and many places of Scripture, such hell-going of Jesus Christ is commemorated, as Hosea 33 [sic: Hosea 13:14], Psalm 16 [:10], 68 [:20?], and 77, in the first epistle to the Corinthians 15th chapter [:55], to the Colossians the 2<sup>nd</sup> [:15], Matthew in the 12th chapter [:24?]. In apostolic



histories chapter 2 [[Acts 2:27](#)], Ephesians 4 [[9-10](#)], Philippians 2 [[8?](#)], 1 Peter 3 [[19](#)], Hebrews 2 [[14](#)]. But are these not sufficient testimonies to prove Christ's descent into hell?

Can one also prove from Scripture which books should be accepted and be considered canonical in the Old Testament?

You can have this from sacred Scripture: For all and every canonical book of the Old Testament is inspired by God, as Paul says, 2 Timothy 3 [[16](#)], and thereafter the Jews trusted, Romans 3 [[2?](#)], and also all were put on by Christ, and thus canonized, Luke 24 [[45](#)], etc.

In this first piece I would like to know one more thing, whether laymen, secular princes, lords, and other common people are also allowed to read the Bible and search the Scriptures?

Why not? It is not only permitted but also commanded by God that we should all search the Scriptures. For thus Christ John speaks to all in chapter 5 [[39](#)]: **Search the Scriptures**. And David says without distinction that he will be well who delights in the law of the Lord, and speaks of it day and night, Psalm 1. For what reason the apostles attributed their epistles to all Christians, as especially to be seen from 1 Thessalonians in chapter 5 [[27](#)], where St. Paul writes: **I charge you by the Lord that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren**. St. John, in his first epistle in the 2nd chapter [[27](#)], clearly testifies that he did not write for the clergy alone, but also for the laity, even for children and young men, when he says: **Dear little children, I write to you that your sins may be forgiven through his name: I write to you fathers, because you are the seed of him who is from the beginning. I write to you young men, because you have overcome the evil one. I write to you children, because you know the Father. I have written to you fathers that you may know him who is from the beginning. I have written to you young men that you are strong, and that the word of God abides with you, and that you have overcome the evil one**. These few testimonies are a mighty thunderbolt against the papists, not to mention that the noble laity are commended in the

Bereans, that they have searched the Scriptures, and have well considered the preaching of St. Paul, Act. 17 [:11]. Queen Candace's chamberlain in Meroe was a layman, and read in the prophet Isaiah. Acts 8 [:28]. The rich man's brethren were laymen, yet Abraham says they should read Moses and the prophets, Luke 16 [:29-31]. As for the princes and authorities, they also have a clear command in God's Word. Thus it is written in the 17th chapter of Deuteronomy [:18]: **When the king sits on the throne of his kingdom, he shall take this other law from the priests, the Levites, and have it written in a book: it shall be with him, and he shall read in it all the days of his life, that he may learn to fear the Lord his God.** To the prince Joshua, God says in the first chapter of the book of Joshua [:8], **"Do not let the book of this law depart from your mouth, but meditate on it day and night, so that you may observe and do all things according to what is written in it.** There you see, dear authorities, how strongly the pope forbids you to do what God requires and wants you to do.

The popes say that there is great danger in the simple-minded reading the Bible, because they can easily fall into error.

The Bible does not make a heretic, nor does the Bible ask for error, nor does it happen with all laymen, but only with some who mix their erroneous thoughts into the Scriptures, and if this objection is valid, the clergy must not read the Bible either, because they often misuse the Scriptures for heresy and error. So much for the first article.

What is the purpose of all that has been said so far?

To this end we must adhere to the recognized truth, and beware of the Jesuit errors, since they pretend 1. that one cannot have faith from Scripture alone. 2. that the Scriptures are obscure and imperfect. 3. that it may not be read by all Christians. From such errors may God the heavenly Father protect us.

Amen.

# Of the Church.

Because the papists boast a lot about the Church, I would like to be properly instructed in this article.

As the Jews in Jeremiah boasted without ceasing, **here is the temple of the Lord, here is the temple of the Lord, here is the temple of the Lord.** So also the popes boast of the church, church, church great, but mere. I will now briefly instruct you on how you should approach this article. First of all, you must know what the true Christian church is and how it can be recognized.

So explain this to me.

The true church is that which abides in the true word of God, and in the holy use of the two sacraments. 1 Tim. 3. Matt. 28. Matt. 26. In our faith the **true church is called a holy, universal, apostolic church.**

Is this true church with us Protestants?

Yes, it is with us, for by the grace of God we have the word of truth, and abide in the pure unadulterated teaching of the holy prophets, evangelists and apostles, and have the right use of both the most holy sacraments. Therefore we can say with good reason that with us is **the one, holy, universal, apostolic Church.**

Why are they called one?

1. because she is the bride of Jesus Christ, but Christ has only **one bride.** 2. because there is only one Christian faith, one Christian baptism, one Lord, and one Christ. To Ephesians 5 Therefore she compares Christ to one sheepfold, one flock. John 10. 3. because it is united in the truth, and only agrees with the one truth.

Why is it called holy?

Not because it is holy in itself, on itself, and of itself, but because it is holy through the

blood of their Lord Bridegroom Jesus Christ, and is sanctified, and washed and cleansed from unholiness. 1 John 1: **The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanses us from all sin.** Ephesians 5: **Christ gave himself to sanctify them, cleansing them by the washing of water in the word. That he might present them to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that they should be holy and without blemish.**

Why is it called catholic?

Not, as the popes think, because most of the world adheres to it: for Christ calls his army a small army, Luke 12 [:32]. Sin would be much more catholic, which is inherent in all and every man in the whole world. Nor is it called catholic because it is old and has lasted a long time: Sin is also old, has lasted almost as long as the world: the devil is also old, all kinds of heresies, shame, epicurean life is old: but it is called catholic because it has the doctrine which is catholic, that which Christ commanded to preach to all creatures, Matt. 28 [:19]. Which went forth into all lands, Ps. 19 [:4]. Which has been beneficial to all creation, Col. 1 [:16]. which doctrine was in the first church, and shall remain to the end of the world, Isaiah 40.

Why is it called apostolic?

Not as if it were built or founded on the apostle Peter, but because of the teaching of the prophets and apostles, as St. Paul himself says in the first letter to the Corinthians 3 [:5-11]: **Who is Paul, who is Apollos? They are servants, etc. I have planted, Apollos has watered, but God has given the growth. So then neither he who plants nor he who waters is anything, but God who gives the increase.** And soon after: **No one can lay any other foundation except the one that has been laid, which is Jesus Christ.** From this we see that we are not founded on men, but on Christ and his teaching, which was revealed to us through the prophets and apostles. As St. Paul says to the Ephesians 2 [:20]: **"You are now built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus**

**Christ being the cornerstone on which the whole building is built," etc.**

Is the Scripture of the apostles more than the church?

Of course, Scripture is much more than the Church. For the Scriptures can be without the Church, but the Church cannot be without the Scriptures, because it is not the Scriptures that are born of the Church, but the Church is born of the Scriptures and of the Word of God. As St. Peter wrote in his first epistle in chapter 1 [:22-23]: **Love one another fervently from a pure heart, as those who have been born again, not of perishable but of imperishable seed, that is, of the word of God, which abides forever.** So then the Word and the Scriptures are mother: but the church is daughter, that is, the Scriptures are more than the church.

Can the true church not err?

The answer to this question is different. It can err, since it is made up of all men: **but all men are liars**, as David says in the Psalm 116 [:11]: it can err and does err in life. **For if any man thinketh that he hath no sin, he deceiveth himself, and the truth is not with him**, saith John in the first chapter of the first epistle [1 John 1:8]. She can err in what concerns her priests and preachers, that they also fall into error, of doctrine and of life, as Aaron fell into idolatry, as Urias the high priest set up an idolatrous altar in the temple of the Lord, as Annas, Caiphas the high priests erred and persecuted Jesus, as those priests erred, of whom Isaiah 28 [:7] says: **Both priests and prophets are mad with strong drink, drowned in wine, and staggered with strong drink; they were mad in prophesying, and they stumble out judgments.** Again in chapter 56 [:10]: **All their watchmen are blind, they all know nothing.** Furthermore, the church can err in several articles that are not directly contrary to the faith, as the apostles did when they thought that Christ's kingdom would be worldly. It also errs in articles of faith, in particular [*particulariter*], so that some persons in the congregation of the church err. On the other hand, it is to be known that

the whole church in all its true members never again completely errs, because it has the Holy Spirit, who leads it into all truth, for even the gates of hell cannot overpower it, Matt. 16 [:18]. And it is impossible that; the elect should be completely deceived, Matt. 24.

So is it true what the popes say: "The Roman Church is not mad?"

This does not follow. For the true church is not bound to Rome: The Roman church, as it is at present, cannot be considered the true apostolic church, but is the *coetus malignantium*, **the church of the wicked**, Psalm 26 [:4-5]. The church in which the wicked walk, and the scoffers sit, Psalm 1 [:1]. although there is no doubt that there are still some in the midst of the multitude who are true adherents of the true church and have an abhorrence for the papal idolatry, just as in this world the pious and the wicked are always mixed together, good and bad fish, good seed and tares, Matthew 13 [:24-30].

But how can one prove that the Roman papal church is not the true church?

This is easy to prove. The Lord Christ says of His Church: **My sheep hear my voice and follow me**, John 10 [:27]. The Roman Church, however, does not hear Christ's voice: as is evident from many articles. It does not want to let the voice of Christ in Scripture pass for the only guiding principle, it does not hear this voice of Christ: **He that believeth on him shall be saved**. Or Mark 9 [:23] *Tantum crede*, only believe. Again since Christ commanded that all Christians should drink from the cup, the Roman Church does not want to hear this. Because it has neither pure doctrine nor the pure use of the sacraments, it cannot be recognized as a true church.

But they have reasons to prove that the Roman Church is the true Church?

I am not unaware that they have some strong arguments and reasons. But I am ready to answer them, hoping that Christian hearts will be satisfied and content.

First of all, they say that Paul himself considered the Roman church to be a true church.

We also admit this, but it does not follow that the Roman Church was a true church for sixteen and a half hundred year, which is why it is so, because much can change in such a time, as has unfortunately happened to this church.

But because it was a true church, it could not have been wrong?

The Roman Church has been a *particularis Ecclesia*, not the universal church, nor the head of the churches, therefore it could well have erred. As St. Paul himself warned them in the epistle to the Romans in the 11th chapter with these words [:21]: **Do not be proud, but be afraid; has God not spared the natural branches, that he might not spare you also?** Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God, the severity in those who have fallen, but the goodness in you, as far as you continue in goodness, otherwise you will also be cut off. The churches at Corinth and Galatia were also true churches, yet they had gone astray even in the days of St. Paul, who planted them. If this could have happened in such a short time, what could not have happened in sixteen and a half hundred years?

The Roman Church has another opportunity, because it has been the mother of all Christendom.

How can this be? For the church at Jerusalem and Antioch was much earlier than that at Rome, and especially the church at Jerusalem is praised in Holy Scripture, that from it the other churches are to be planted, Isaiah 2 [:3]: **From Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.** David in the 110th Psalm [:2]: **The Lord will send the scepter of thy kingdom out of Zion.** Thus the church at Jerusalem is to be regarded as the mother rather than the Roman church, because it is older than the Roman church and it is said in Scripture that the Word of the Lord is to go forth from Jerusalem.

Paul says to the Romans in chapter 1 [:8] that the faith of the Roman church is said in all the world to be much higher, even a mother of all other churches.

This cannot follow, otherwise the papists would have to admit that the church at Thessalonica is also higher than others,

indeed that it is the mother of others. Because St. Paul also writes about her in the first epistle to the Thessalonians in chapter 1 [:8]: **The word of the Lord has gone forth from you, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but also in all places your faith in God has broken out.** Therefore the Roman church has no preference over this church.

Christ promises in John 16 [:13] the Holy Spirit, who is to guide the churches into all truth.

This promise actually concerns the apostles and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, which took place at Pentecost, so it can by no means be applied to the present Roman synagogue. And although it is true that the Holy Spirit instructs the true church in all truth, namely through the word of truth, it does not follow that the Roman church does not err, because it does not want to be judged, taught or instructed by the Spirit of God, just as the Holy Spirit is often grieved, resisted and contradicted when lies are taken for truth, as Paul testifies in 2 Thessalonians 2 [:10].

In Matthew 16 [:18] Christ says: The gates of hell shall not prevail against the church.

We know this and firmly believe that even though all the gates of hell are set against us, they shall not prevail against us, for as David says in Psalm 46 [:1-5]: **God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore we will not fear, though the world perish, though the mountains fall into the midst of the sea. Even if the sea roar and be though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof. Nevertheless, the city of God will remain beautiful with its fountains, where the holy dwellings of the Most High are. God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved.** Christ speaks of this protection in Matthew 16 [:18] and says that even the gates of hell will not prevail against the true church. No man of understanding will be able to force from this that the Roman Church may not err. For Christ's church is not bound to Rome but is gathered without distinction of persons or cities from all the people who fear God, Acts 10 [:34].



In Matthew 28 [:20], Christ promises the Church his presence and says that he will remain with her until the end of the age.

Of course, the Lord Christ does this; he remains with us eternally with his grace as long as we do not depart from him. But if we do not want to remain with him, with His Word, then He departs and goes away, just as he departed from the Gadarenes, Matthew 8 [:34]. Therefore it does not follow from this promise of Christ that the Roman Church cannot err. Christ does not speak of the Roman Church alone, but of all Christendom, of all Christian congregations. The church at Corinth and Galatia had as much reason to be comforted by this promise of Jesus Christ as the Roman church, yet they have erred and allowed themselves to be led away from the recognized truth; Christ the bridegroom is indeed faithful, if only the bride, the Church, were also faithful. But she is sometimes unfaithful, not keeping her duty to the Lord Christ, just as the Roman synagogue has become an adulteress, because she has taken another head, another bridegroom besides Christ, namely the Roman Pope. Therefore, in the Revelation of John 17 and 18, she is called a harlot, a dwelling place of devils, a container of all unclean spirits, a container of all unclean hostile birds.

So if the Roman Church became a harlot, it would follow that Christ would have had no bride for a long time and our ancestors would all have been damned.

God be praised for that. Is Christ bound to Rome in the same way? Although the Roman Church and the papacy itself were not Christ's bride, Christ nevertheless had his bride and church in the midst of the papacy; indeed, as Luther speaks more blessedly: Under the papacy there remained a true nucleus of elect Christians; for there were many thousands of little children who were incorporated into the Lord Christ through baptism. After that there were many Christians who were ignorant of some errors, but who retained the reason for their salvation, Jesus Christ. They had to take comfort in Christ's intercession, which he made at the foot of the cross: **Lord, forgive them, they know not what they do.** They did not know the abomination of the mass, because the mass was in Latin, and secretly mumbled by the priests,

and there is no doubt that God worked in them the right faith through the Gospels, through the history of the Passion, Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, which was nevertheless still read to the people in the papacy throughout the year, fulfilling what God promised in the 55th chapter of Isaiah [:11]: **My word shall not return to me void, but shall do whatsoever I please, and shall prosper whereunto I send it.** Furthermore, there were also many of them who publicly contradicted **the pope's** arrogance, avarice and deceit, for which reason they were executed by him and tyrannically brought from life to death. Their names are all mentioned in Heaven, Luke 10 [:11?], but some are mentioned in the *Catalogo testium veritatis*, in the *Martyrologia Nigrini*, and other books. John says of them in the 17th chapter of Revelation [:6]: **I saw the woman drink of the blood of the saints and of the blood of the witnesses of Jesus.** But many were under the papacy, whose mouths were shut, who were not allowed to resist for fear of danger, but who meanwhile sighed, called upon God diligently, and committed their bodies and souls to him. But all this is undeniable, that many, many hundreds of Christians, even in their deathbeds, prepared themselves for the blessed journey. For it was necessary for them to be pointed unanimously and solely to the merit of Jesus Christ and to be reminded to recognize their sins and to truly believe in Christ Jesus. The papists and Jesuits cannot deny that [Anshelm's questionnaires](#) are used with dying persons, which has indeed been of great benefit to the sick. And there is no harm in placing them here, so that we may see how our ancestors died blessedly in the midst of the accursed heap. This is what St. Anshelm himself writes:

If one of our brethren is in his last days, it is godly and advisable that he be well instructed by a prelate or another priest in the following questions and admonitions, and that he be asked first:

Brother, do you rejoice that you will die in faith? and he answered, **Yes.**

Confess that you have not lived as well as you should? Answer: **Yes, I confess it.**

Do you regret it? **Yes.**

Do you have the intention that you would improve yourself if you lived longer? Answer: **Yes**.

Do you believe that the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, died because of you? Answer: **Yes**.

Do you believe that you cannot be saved except through his death? Answer: **Yes**.

Do you thank him from the bottom of your heart? **Yes**.

Now then, thank him, as long as you live, put all your trust in this death alone, commit yourself completely to this death, cover yourself completely with this death, wrap yourself completely in it, and when the Lord wants to judge you, say: Lord, I put the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and you and your judgment, otherwise I will not argue with you. If he says, "You are guilty of judgment," say, "I put the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and the merit of his most worthy suffering, which I bring instead of the merit that I should have and unfortunately do not have. He also said, "I put the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and your wrath. Then he says three times, **Lord, into your hands I commend my spirit**. And let those standing around him answer: Lord, into your hands we commend this patient's spirit. Then he will gently fall asleep and will not see death forever. So far Anselm.

O how blessed our ancestors died who were practiced in such matters. To see from this how it is a vain pretense to our adversaries, as if our ancestors must all be damned if the Roman church had not always been the true church. The Holy Spirit said through the prophet Daniel in the 12th chapter [:41]: "Three kinds will escape from the hands of the Antichrist: Edom, Moab, and the firstfruits of the children of Ammon. What these three names mean is very finely explained by Luther in his Bible in the 12th chapter of Daniel, where he writes thus: The pope will not cut down or deceive three nations; they will remain and be the holy Christian church under the destroyer, the last Christ. For the holy church must remain until the end of the world. The first are Edomites. Edom means red color. The Edomites are the holy martyrs who have allowed themselves to be constantly martyred by the pope, bishops, doctors, especially by

the bloodhounds of the preacher orders, who have martyred, strangled, drowned and burned many of the masses throughout the world to this day.

The others are Moabites. Moab means from the father, or paternal, *paternus*. These are those who remain in the world from time to time and have not fallen away from their father Christ. They may not have been public preachers, but in the end they relied on Christ's death and did not die on the [Pope's Mausim](#), nor on his letters of indulgence. I have seen quite a few of them myself, and heard of many more, from Munich and all sorts of towns. Just as St. Bernard also did, when he thought his hour had come, he forgot his order and everything of papal Mausim, and committed himself to Christ's suffering with these words: Christ inherited the kingdom of heaven by two rights: first, as the only, eternal Son, the right remains his alone. Secondly, as earned through his suffering. He has given us this right and merit, for he suffered for our sake. God asked these Bernards and Moabites, or fatherly Christians, to keep much for him, as he did the seven thousand of the people of Israel at the time of Elijah.

The third, *principium filiorum Ammon*, that is, the firstfruits of the children of the people. Moab and Ammon were brothers, so these Ammonites want to become brothers of the paternal *fraterni*. I understand these to be the young, innocent group that is born again from baptism, that is born before it recognizes or respects the pope's Mausim, that can neither strengthen nor weaken it, as the Edomites and Moabites do. That is why they are called the firstfruits and children of the people, that is, of the people of God in the Church, recently born through baptism. These the Antichrist had to leave unchallenged and unled. So far Luther.

I am content with the answer, but the Pope's desire that we should name all those who did not follow the Roman Church in the days of our ancestors.

This is an outrageous request. How can we name them all if we weren't alive at the time? Despite the fact that they call them all by name that they like. It is enough for the elect to be written in God's book of remembrance, Malach 3 [:16], into the hands of God, Isaiah 49, into heaven, Luke 10, it is enough that they have known God.

For as St. Paul says, 2 Timothy. 2 [:19]: **The solid foundation of God exists and has this seal: The Lord knows his own.** The holy prophet Elijah indeed could not have said who or what the seven thousand were who had not bowed the knee to Baal, for he thought there were none. But God knew them and said: "There are **still seven thousand left who are righteous and have not worshipped Baal.** So there is no doubt that many thousands have not bowed the knee to the papal abomination of the Mass, whom we cannot name. St. John in Revelation nevertheless sets a fine number of the innocent, as he says in the 14th chapter [:1]: **I beheld, and, lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Zion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads.** And soon afterward he says [:4], **These are the ones who are not endowed with wives, for they are virgins and follow the Lamb wherever he goes. These have been bought from among men, as firstfruits to God and the Lamb, and in their mouths no falsehood is found, for they are blameless for the throne of God.** The Jesuits may quarrel with St. John as to why he did not name these hundred forty and four thousand candidates by name.

Could there have been a genuine church among the papists?

Although the priests, prelates, monks, bishops, cardinals and popes themselves were not the true church, God nevertheless had His Church in the midst of the papacy. And it may well be that the clergy did not belong to the true church, but were nevertheless in the church. Therefore Paul says in 2 Thessalonians 2 [:4], that the Antichrist will sit in the midst of the temple of God, not apart from the temple of God, and yet will not be a member of the temple of God. Matthew 13 says: That which is of the field of God is in the church his good seed and tares, good and bad fish. But the evil fish, the tares, are not a proper member of the church, even though they are in the church. Another similarity: Christ says in John 18 [:36]: **My kingdom is not of this world.** This word is true. But nevertheless the kingdom of Christ is in this

world. So Christ's kingdom can be in this world, but not of this world. So the church can have remained in the papacy and yet not have been of the papacy: *Papatus fuit in Ecclesia, non de Ecclesia. Ecclesia fuit in Papatu, non de Papatu.* [[Google](#)]

The popes say that if our church was the true church, and the true church also under the papacy, then we should call it a church that taught precisely what we now teach.

This is the noblest of interjections, one that our opponents brag about a lot. But it does not have much substance. There are two questions: whether the Church under the papacy taught exactly what we now teach, and whether it believed exactly what we now believe. The true Church has always had the faith that we have, according to the guidance of Scripture, but with differences. At one time it had no stubble at all beside it, at another time its stubble and tares ran along with it, as happened in the papacy. But the stubble was burned and consumed in the furnace of the cross.

As far as teaching is concerned, the Church taught exactly what we now teach, as in the times of the patriarchs, prophets, evangelists and apostles, the teachers taught as we do, but mixed in some things that were not right, which we do not teach either. In the days of Christ, the Pharisees and Scribes sat on the throne of Moses, reading Moses, but also reading their essays. In the days of the church under the papacy, baptism with water and the word was practiced, but other abuses were mixed in. The Word of God was read as we do, but other false interpretations were mixed in.

Therefore, even if after the times of the first apostolic churches this very thing was not publicly taught which we now teach, it does not follow that there was no true church then, because it is nothing new that the preaching office is falsified and not entirely pure. Nevertheless, lest the popes should say: We cannot name a church which taught in matters of faith precisely what we teach, we call them the church of the prophets, the apostles and the first apostolic church, with which doctrine our confession

and creed is in complete agreement. But when they say, according to their custom: They do not speak of the first apostolic church, but of the subsequent one, it is evident how they have an abhorrence of the apostolic church, which is, after all, the other example of all. They could have done well to help the Jews and Pharisees against John the Baptist and Christ himself. For is it not so: if the Pharisees and Jews had wanted to force John the Baptist to say which church before him had taught just this, about baptism, about Jesus, about the cessation of the Levitical sacrifices and the law, then John would have appealed to the prophets' church and teaching, who had taught just this. The Popes could now train the Jews well. They should not reject the first prophetic church, but John should name another, after the prophetic church, soon before the birth of Christ, which would have taught this very thing. Of course, John and Christ soon realized that the Jews were scoffers, and even if they had not been able to identify a church after the prophetic church that taught this very thing, there would still have been a true church at all times that believed this very thing, and Christ answered them, John 10 [:7]: **All who came before me were thieves and murderers.**

Do you think that there can be a true church if the preaching ministry is not pure?

This may well be the case, as it is irrefutably proven. For is it not true that in the days of the godless King Ahaz there was no pure preaching ministry? Of course, there was a true church all the same. At the time of the birth of Jesus Christ there was also no pure preaching ministry, yet God gathered him a church. It was the same under the tyranny of the Antichrist: there was a proper preaching ministry, but not a pure one, but they had built up all kinds of stubble, which could not stand in God's way so that he would not have preserved his church.

Has God been powerful through such preaching?

Yes, because God is not bound to people: Man's unfaithfulness cannot overthrow God's faithfulness. Therefore, because the papal priests were in the ordinary office,

even if they were otherwise heretics, they nevertheless baptized rightly with water and the Word. This can be clearly demonstrated to them when one asks whether the children baptized by us were baptized correctly. Then they say: Yes, and do not baptize them again. If you ask further: Who are the preachers? They answer: Heretics. Can the heretics baptize properly? They answer: Yes, because they sit in the ordinary office of preaching and administer the sacrament according to the institution of Christ, their baptism cannot be blamed. If one of them were to say, "Oh, then they are true preachers," the Jesuits would say no, and quickly distinguish the ordinary ministry and its proper administration from their errors. So they must confess that a preaching ministry that is not entirely pure nevertheless does God's work, or rather that God works his will through it. Judas was a devil, John 6, but even so, if he taught God's word, his preaching ministry was not without power. Before I conclude this, however, I would like some of the Jesuits to show me and name a certain church that has taught precisely what is now being taught in Rome under the guidance of the Council of Trent. If some pope will name me a certain church which before the Council of Trent taught everything and anything in matters of faith in the same way as is now taught in Rome after the Council, I will give them the benefit of the doubt and gladly let them show me. But I am certain that a thousand years will pass before the popes will be able to do so.

But is the evangelical preaching office now pure?

Yes, praise and thanks be to God. We now have pure teachers in our churches, and God, by special grace, has provided for his Christianity, which for so long lay under the darkness and tyranny of the Antichrist, has restored it, and through his chosen instrument, Luther (of whom he clearly prophesied in Isaiah 11, Daniel 12, in the Revelation of John chapter 14), has completely repurified the church and cleansed it of all papal stubble, as he had previously promised.



What do the popes say about Luther? They laugh that God should have accomplished such a work through such an lowly person?

Mockery and laughter is easy for them. We should know that God has often done great things through little poor people. Who was Moses? A shepherd, yet he led the people of Israel out of Egypt. Who was David? Yet he was chosen by God to be a king. Who was the mother of God? A poor, lowly maiden who was entrusted to a carpenter. Yet she gave birth to the Son of God and the Savior of the world? That is why she says: God looked upon his wretched handmaid and exalted the lowly. Who were the apostles? Poor fishermen. Yet through them the Lord Christ had appointed the holy ministry. And this is what David says in Psalm 113 [:5-6]: **Who is like the Lord our God, who has set himself on high and looks down on the lowly in heaven and on earth?** Again in Psalm 8 [:2]: **Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings you have prepared for yourself a power. For God's power is mighty in the weak.** 2 Cor. 12 [:9], and Peter says in 1 Epistle 5 [:5]: **God resists the proud, but gives grace to the humble.** This is what St. Paul writes in the first chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians [:26-28]: **"Behold, brethren, your calling, not many are called according to the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble: but what is foolish in the sight of the world God has chosen to put to shame those who are wise, and what is weak in the sight of the world God has chosen to put to shame those who are strong. And that which is base and despised God has chosen, and that which is nothing, to bring to nothing that which is something.** Which indeed God also proved in this work, when he put to shame the pope, cardinals, bishops, prelates, who wanted to be something, and drew forth the poor Augustinian monk Martin Luther, who seemed to be nothing.

What can you think of Luther, because you yourself confess that he was a monk?

That does not stop him. He didn't know any different until God enlightened him and led him out of the papal mud. What was Paul? He was much worse than

Luther. Saul was full of snorting and murder against the disciples of Christ, Acts 9 [:1-2], yet God used him as the chosen armor to preach his name among the Gentiles. St. Paul himself recognizes this, as he says in the first letter to the Corinthians, chapter 15 [:9]: **I am the least of the apostles, as I am not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God. But by the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace toward me has not been in vain, but I have labored much more than they all: not I, but the grace of God that is in me.** And in the first epistle to Timothy in the first chapter, he writes very finely like this [:12-13]: **I thank our Lord Christ Jesus, who has made me strong and faithful, and set me in the ministry, whereas before I was a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and a reviler. But I have been shown mercy, because I did it ignorantly, in unbelief.** Just as we do not despise St. Paul, even though he was once a blasphemer, so we do not despise Luther, even though he was once a papist.

Nevertheless, Luther did not know everything at first, but still had a number of errors, which he only later discarded and retracted.

We know this well and confess that he was not completely enlightened in one hour or one year, but that God dealt with him successively, as also happened with the apostles, who had Christ Jesus as their teacher for four and a half years, yet they were still unbelieving, as can be seen in Thomas, and were still hard, as Christ after his resurrection reproached them for their unbelief and hardness of heart, Mark 16. [:14] Indeed, before the ascension of Christ and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, they were still mistaken, allowing them to dream that Christ would establish a worldly kingdom, an error which they did not dispel until afterward.

Thus Luke also writes in chapter 4 of the Apostolic Histories [Acts 4:13]: **"The people saw the joy of Peter and John and were astonished, for they were certain that they were unlearned men (idiots) and laymen.** Just as it would be ungodly to despise St. Peter and John, as well as other apostles, because they did not soon learn and know everything

correctly, so we cannot blame Luther, blessed as he was, for still being in some errors at first, out of which he later, with God's grace, extricated himself. What did St. Augustine do? Did he not write whole books of retractions in which he recanted his previous errors? And what is this to keep us from being blessed by Luther? We know that St. Peter, after he had already received the Holy Spirit, nevertheless stumbled, or as St. Paul says, he pretended and did not walk correctly according to the truth of the Gospel, which is why Paul, to his face [*in faciem*], also resisted him under before his eyes, as is written in the epistle to the Galatians in chapter 2 [:11]: And so much can be said about this part of our faith, from which we are confirmed in the truth and protected from error.

## The third article. [ToC](#)

# Of justification

### of the poor sinner before God.

What is the main dispute in this article?

The chief controversy is about what moves God to forgive poor sinful man his sin, how he accepts him by grace and justifies him. That is to say, the question is what and which is the righteousness by which we are absolved of sin and considered righteous before the Old Face of God. According to the Jesuits, it is the righteousness by which we are justified by our own works and obedience. This is poured into us by God, that it may dwell and be in us. We Evangelicals, however, hold that man is justified and eternally saved through the righteousness of Jesus Christ, by grace, and taken by faith, and thus believe that our righteousness does not consist in us, but apart from us [*i.e.* “**objective**”], in the gracious forgiveness of sins and the saving merit of Jesus Christ.

How do you actually describe justification?

The justification of the sinner before God is a work not of man, but of God, who through his unfounded goodness, love, grace and mercy, in the merit of Jesus Christ, absolves all who believe in his

Son Jesus Christ from sin and its spiritual and eternal punishment, and thus imputes to them the righteousness of Jesus Christ through true faith.

What should I pay particular attention to in this description?

On these four things: First, that our justification is not the work of men, but of God alone. Second, that it comes from the grace, love, and mercy of God toward us. Third, that it is not earned through our merit, but through the merit of the Lord Jesus Christ, through his bitter suffering, death and resurrection. Fourth, that it is received, appropriated and applied to us solely through faith in Jesus Christ.

Prove it properly, piece by piece, from holy, divine scripture.

The first point, that justification is the work of God, is easy to prove. For it is a good gift: **all good gifts, and all perfect gifts, come down from above, from the Father of lights.** James 1 [:17] Wherefore Isaiah in chapter 45 [:21-22] saith thus, **If I have not done it? and there is no God else beside me; a just God and a Saviour; there is none beside me. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else.** Again [Isa. 45:25]: **In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified.** St. Paul to the Romans chapter 3 [:26]: **That he alone may be just, and justify him that is of faith in Jesus.** Romans 8 [:33]: **Who will accuse the elect of God? God is here who justifies.** To the Galatians, chapter 3 [:8]: **The Scriptures have shown beforehand that God justifies the Gentiles through faith.** In these testimonies, justification is clearly attributed to God, that it is his work.

Also a second proof.

Secondly, as to the grace, goodness, love and mercy of God, that the same is the source and fountain of our justification, I prove with the following testimonies:

In Romans 3 [:23-24]: **They are all sinners, and lack the glory that they should have in God, and are justified by his grace without merit.**

Ephesians 2 [:8-9]: **By grace you have been saved, not of yourselves; it is the grace of God, not of works, lest anyone should boast.**

Titus 3 [:5]: **But then appeared the kindness and the glory of God our Savior, not because of the works which we had done, but according to his mercy he saved us, etc. So that by his grace we might be justified and become heirs of eternal life, according to the hope that is surely true.**

Ephesians 2 [:4]: **God, who is rich in mercy, through his great love, so that when we were dead in sins, he loved us and made us alive together in Christ.**

In the first epistle of John in the fourth chapter [:10]: **In this is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us.**

Romans 11 [:6]: **If by grace, then is it no more of works.**

From this we can see clearly enough how our salvation and blessedness come from the pure grace, love, goodness, and mercy of God.

How do you prove it thirdly?

Thirdly, it is easy to prove that our righteousness is based solely on the merit of Jesus Christ. For from him, through him, because of his death and merit, we receive forgiveness of sins, salvation and eternal life.

Isaiah 53 [:11]: **My servant, the righteous, will justify many by his knowledge.**

Item [:3]: **By his wounds we have been healed.**

Isaiah 61 [:10]: **I rejoice in the Lord, and my heart is glad. For he has clothed me with garments of righteousness and with the robe of salvation.**

Isaiah 63 [:1]: **I am he who teaches righteousness, and I am a master to help. I tread the winepress alone, and there is no one among the nations with me.**

Jeremiah 23 [:6]: **This is his name, the Lord, our righteousness.**

Matt. 1 [:21]: **You will call him Jesus. For he will save his people from their sins.**

John 1 [:29]: **This is the Lamb of God who bears the sin of the world.**

In the first chapter of the first epistle of John [:7]: **The blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, cleanses us from all unremoved sins.**

And in chapter 2 [:2]: **Jesus Christ is the propitiation for our sin, not only for ours, but also for the whole world.**

Romans 5 [:19]: **Just as through one man's disobedience many of them became sinners, so through one man's obedience many of them will be justified.**

Romans 5 [:1]: **Now that we have been justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom also we have access by faith into this grace in which we stand.**

Romans 4 [:25]: **Christ was delivered up because of our sins and rose again because of our righteousness.**

Romans 10 [:4]: **Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone who believes in him.**

In the first epistle to the Corinthians at the beginning [:30-31]: **Christ was made for us by God, for wisdom and for righteousness and for sanctification and for redemption, so that, as it is written: Whoever boasts, let him boast in the Lord.**

John 10 [:28]: **I give them eternal life.**

2 Corinthians 5 [:21]. **God made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that we might attain to the righteousness that is before God.**

In the Apostolic Histories, chapter 4 [Acts 4:12]: **There is salvation in no other, nor is there any other name given to men whereby we must be saved than the name of Jesus.**

And in chapter 10 [:43]: **All the prophets testify to this Jesus, that through his name all who believe in him shall receive forgiveness of sins.**

And in sum, we are left with the one foundation of our salvation, of which St. Paul writes in the first epistle to the Corinthians on the 3rd [:11]: **No one can lay any other foundation except the one that has been laid, which is Jesus Christ.**

Philip. 3 [:8]: **I have counted it all dung, that I might gain Christ only, and be found in him; that I might not have my righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Jesus Christ.**

Do not all these passages speak of Jesus, do they not all say that Christ is our righteousness, our reconciliation, that in him we have salvation and eternal life? That he is the only reason for our eternal salvation?

Yes, it's no different. Now move on to the fourth piece.

Fourth, that the righteousness which is before God is imputed to us through faith alone, and that through faith alone we become capable of and partakers of the righteousness which comes from God's grace and is merited for us through Christ Jesus, we prove from the unanimous voice of all Holy Scripture.

In the 15th chapter of the first book of Moses [:6]: **Abraham believed in God and this was counted to him for righteousness.**

Habakkuk on the other [:4]: **The righteous will live by his faith.**

John 1 [:12]: **As many as received him (Jesus), to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.**

John 3 [:16]: **God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.**

John 20 [:31]: **These signs are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name.**

Matthew 9 [:29]: **May it be done to you according to your faith.**

Again [:22]: **Be of good cheer, my daughter, your faith has helped you.**

Matthew 15 [:28]: **O woman, your faith is great, let it be done to you as you wish.**

In the apostolic histories on 3 [Acts 3:15]: **You killed the Prince of Life, whom God raised from the dead; we are witnesses of this. And through faith in his name he has confirmed his name in this one whom you see and know, and faith through him has given him health in your sight.**

In chapter 13 [:38-39]: **Be it known unto you therefore, brethren, that forgiveness of sins is preached unto you by**

**this (Jesus), and of all that by which ye could not be justified in the law of Moses. But he that believeth on him is righteous.**

In the 16th chapter, the jailer asks Paul and Silam [Acts 16:30-31]: **"Sirs, what shall I do to be saved? St. Paul and Silas said: Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and you and your household will be saved.**

In the epistle to the Romans in chapter 1 [:17]: **In the gospel is revealed the righteousness that is before God, which is by faith in faith. As it is written: The just shall live by faith.**

Chapter 3 [:21-22]: **Now the righteousness that is before God is revealed and testified to by the law and the prophets, without the intervention of the law. But I speak of such righteousness before God as comes through faith in Jesus Christ to all and on all who believe.**

Again [:28]: **So then we hold that a man is justified without the work of the law, through faith alone.**

To Romans 4 [:4-5]: **To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.**

In the second chapter of the epistle to the Galatians [:16]: **Knowing that a man is not justified by the work of the law, but by faith in Jesus Christ, we also believe in Christ Jesus, so that we may be justified by faith in Christ and not by the work of the law, for by the work of the law no flesh is justified.**

The third chapter contains the following testimonies [:6-8]: **Just as Abraham believed God and it was credited to him for righteousness, so now you know that those who have faith are the children of Abraham. Now the Scripture has already shown that God justifies the Gentiles through faith.**

Again [:11]: **The righteous will live by his faith.**

Again [:22]: **The Scriptures have divided all things under sin, that the promise might come through faith in Jesus Christ.**



Again [:24-26]: **The law was our tutor in Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith has come, we are no longer under the disciplinarian, for you are all children of God through faith in Christ Jesus.**

Oh, dear Christians, open your eyes and see how brightly, how clearly, how explicitly the Scriptures testify that we are justified by faith in Jesus Christ. In these testimonies of works, they do not mention by one word that they are to justify us, but rather rejects them and cuts off all power of justification from them [Matthew 13:9]. **Let him who has eyes to see, let him see; let him who has ears to hear, let him hear.**

I feel and grasp that your teaching is founded in God's Word. But how can I sufficiently demonstrate that we are not justified and saved by our works?

Just as we have now heard how faith is the only means by which we appropriate to ourselves the power of the merit of Jesus Christ and justification. Now the merit of works is not such a means, because it is entirely separated. But for the sake of more certainty I will add some immovable reasons to prove that we are not justified and saved by our works.

And first of all, the clear examples show this. Speaking of Abraham, St. Paul says to the Romans, chapter 4 [:1-3], **What then do we say of our father Abraham, that he was found after the flesh? This is what we say: If Abraham is righteous by works, he has glory, but not before God. But what do the Scriptures say? Abraham believed God, and this was counted to him for righteousness.**

Furthermore, he says of David thus [:6-7]: **According to which manner also David saith, that salvation is of man only, to whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.**

St. Paul says of himself that he is not saved by his good works, but by faith in Christ.

In the first epistle to the Corinthians in chapter 4 [:4]: **I am conscious of nothing, but in this I am not justified.**

Galat. 5 [:4]: **You have lost Christ, who would be justified by the law and have fallen from grace.**

In the epistle to the Philippians in chapter 3 he writes [:8-10]: **What things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ's sake, because I counted all things loss for the exalted knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, for which I counted all things loss and counted them dung, that I might gain Christ and be found in him, not having my righteousness which is by the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, that is, the righteousness which is imputed by God to faith, to know him and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings.**

Therefore he says in the epistle to the Galatians in chapter 2 [:15-16]: **Although we are Jews by nature and not sinners from among the Gentiles, yet because we know that a man is not justified by the work of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, we also believe in Christ Jesus, so that we may be justified by faith in Christ and not by the work of the law; for by the work of the law no flesh is justified.**

So Christ forgave the sin of a man who had broken his sin without any previous good works. Matth. 9 [:2-17].

The publican also went into his house justified before the Pharisee, without the merit of good works, for he was a great sinner. Luc. 18 [:14].

The thief on the cross became righteous and an heir of eternal paradise even without all his previous merits. Luc. 23 [:32-43].

I want to ask something about Abraham: if he was justified without works, why does James say in the 2nd chapter that he was justified by works when he sacrificed Isaac on the altar?

That Abraham was saved by faith and not by works is attested by Moses in the first book, chapter 15 [:1-21], and by St. Paul to the Romans in chapter 4 [:3, 22]. As far as James's word is concerned, one could well answer that the old teachers of the Church from many hundreds of years ago held this book to be suspect, which is why it is not a canonical book. But this time I will answer in another way: St. James does not speak of justification before God,

but of justification before men, how one should prove himself, that the world also may know him to be righteous. James says that faith must prove itself by works, as did Abraham, who was justified before God by faith. But that men should also see his faith, God tempted him, and Abraham obeyed and would sacrifice his son Isaac, so that all the world might accept his faith before God. That this is St. James's opinion, he himself proves in the preceding words [2:18]: **Show me your faith with your works, and I will also show you my faith with my works.** Here we see clearly that St. James speaks of the demonstration of faith, and that is what he means by being justified, namely, from effect & sight [*ex effectu & conspectu*] before the world, which sees from the fruits what kind of tree there is.

Now proceed to the other reasons, that you may prove that man is not justified by works.

Scripture says this in plain and clear words, as many passages have already been introduced. As to Romans 3 [:21-31]: **The righteousness that is before God is revealed without the work of the law.** Again [:28]: **So we hold that a man is justified without the works of the law through faith alone.**

Romans 4 [:5]: **But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.**

Galatians chapter 2 [:16]: **We know that a man is not justified by the works of the law.**

Again [:16]: **That we may be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the work of the law, for by the work of the law no man is justified.**

Ephesians chapter 2 [:8]: **By grace you have been saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God, not of works.**

Titus chapter 3 [:5]: **It is not for the works of righteousness that we have done that he saves us.**

And how can we be saved by the merit of our works, because we are saved by grace, as has been shown many times above? Therefore St. Paul concludes in

the Epistle to the Romans in the 11th chapter thus [:6]: **If it is by grace, it is not merit of works, otherwise grace would not be grace. But if it is from the merit of works, then grace is nothing, otherwise merit would not be merit**, as *Augustine* also says: *Gratia Dei non esset gratia vilo modo, si non daretur gratis omni modo*, that is: God's grace is by no means grace, if it is not always given by pure grace.

According to this, Scripture testifies that if we were to be saved by works, Christ would have died in vain. So Paul says to the Galatians on 2 [:21]: **If righteousness comes through the law, then Christ died in vain.**

Furthermore, salvation cannot be ascribed to works, because without this we are obliged to praise God with good works, Matt. 5, and yet finally receive no other testimony from Christ than this, of which he says, Luke 17 [:10]: **If you have done all that is commanded you, say, we are useless servants, we have done what we were obliged to do.**

Beyond this our works cannot merit salvation, because they are wholly imperfect, wholly impure and defiled. For even if we consider our righteousness, that is, our best works, they are still like an unclean garment, which must not be called honorable, as *Isaiah* says in 64 [:6]: *Omnes justitiae nostrae, sicut pannus menstruatae*. **We are all like the unclean, and all our righteousness is like an unclean garment.** The holy apostle Paul says to the Philippians in chapter 3 [:8]: For the sake of Christ he considered all his good works to be harm and filth.

Why then is eternal life called a [Merces](#) or reward, if we are not saved by works?

The word reward, *merces*, is used in two ways in Scripture: first, for a due reward, since there is a right proportion between the merit and the reward. Of this there is no doubt. Secondly, the word *merces* is also used for a gracious gift from God, which he gives us out of pure grace, without consideration of our services. As in the 15th chapter of Genesis,

God says to Abraham [:1]: **I am your shield and your very great reward**. Then it is certain that it was not the merit of a mere man who earned God himself as a reward in heaven. And if Abraham had merited the whole world, God would still not have been his reward because of his merit, because God is infinite, but all human activity is finite. Thus in the 127th Psalm this word *merces* is also written: *Ecce haereditas Domini filii sunt, & merces fructus ventris*. That is why Luther rightly said: **Behold, children are a gift of the Lord, and the fruit of the womb is a gift**. Here the word *merces*, which otherwise means a reward, is rightly interpreted as a gift; for children are not a deserved reward of the parents because of their good works, but a pure gift of grace, otherwise it would have to follow that the Jews, Turks and other ungodly people also have such good works, so that they deserve this blessing of the Lord, no sensible person would say that.

In the 40th chapter of the prophet Isaiah it says this about the future of the Lord Messiah [:10]: **Behold, the Lord, the Lord is coming mightily, and his arm will reign; behold, his reward is with him**. That is, he brings with him many gifts of grace, which he will distribute as forgiveness of sins, righteousness and eternal salvation. In the 31st chapter of the prophet Jeremiah, we also see that God promises those in Jerusalem his gracious help and will deliver them from all evil, saying [:16]: **Leave your crying and weeping and the tears of your eyes, for your work will be rewarded**. What good works, what merit were there? Nothing everywhere, but evil deeds and sin. Nevertheless, God said he would reward their work, that is, he would look upon them with the eyes of mercy. Just as in the above-mentioned passages the word *merces*, reward, is used for an undeserved reward, for a gift of grace, so when eternal life is called a reward, it must also mean an undeserved gracious reward, which comes from pure grace, not from the merit of works, because eternal life is a gift of grace. In Romans 6, as has so far been irrefutably proven.

St. Paul says in the first epistle to the Corinthians in chapter 13 [:2]: If he had all faith and did not have love, he would be nothing.

It does not follow from this that love saves and not faith. For St. Paul is not talking about faith that saves, but about miraculous faith, through which it could move mountains. This faith is useless if it is without and against love. Judas had such faith, but it did not help him because he did not have love. Many in that day will praise their miraculous faith and say [:22]: **Lord, did we not testify in your name? Did we not cast out devils in your name? Did we not do many deeds in your name?** But Christ will answer: **I have never known you; depart from me, you evildoers.**

Galatians 5 says that faith is active through love.

It is certainly active through love, for every good tree bears good fruit. But it does not follow that therefore love with faith makes us blessed, for faith is considered differently: For one thing, as it justifies before God. There it is considered without all works, united and alone in that it grasps Jesus Christ. On the other hand, how it benefits the neighbor, how it shows itself, and there faith is not found without works, but in conjunction, together, where faith is, there love is also.

But because they are so undivided and united, must love indeed also with faith justify?

This does not follow. The heat of the sun cannot be separated from the brightness of the sun, but is together, but the brightness of the sun does not heat, the heat of the sun does not shine, but the brightness shines, the heat heats. So also, although faith and love are together, it is not love that makes righteous, but each has its own *effectum*, its own quality. Faith believes and justifies, love loves. And just as love alone loves, so faith alone believes in Christ Jesus and alone saves without love.

Why did Luther add the word alone, Rom. 3 [:28], since it is not in the Greek text?

Luther did not do this out of sacrilege, but for very important reasons. 1. He has hereby declared the *emphasio*,

the emphasis of the Greek language to be. For what the Greeks say by εὐν μῆ, the Germans rightly say as **alone**, as all who are acquainted with the Greek and German languages must testify. 2. Therefore also the Syrian interpreter in Paul's passage to the Romans chapter 4 put the word *Balchud*, alone, **but then, that not with works but by faith alone**. Is *Syrus* supposed to have committed a knave's trick? By no means. Well, Luther, more blessedly, did not commit a knave's play either. 3. About which it is elsewhere clearly stated, Mark 5 [:36], Luke 8 [:50]. *tantum crede, only believe*. What is that but: If thou hast faith alone. And although someone would say that it is spoken of an *objecto fidei externo*, yet to such a one it is to be answered that if the Lord God will have faith alone, and not our own worthiness for bodily things: How much more will he have faith for things pertaining to eternal salvation, which is not based on our own good works, holiness and righteousness, but solely on God's pure grace and mercy and on the merit of Jesus Christ, as the right foundation that can stand, as Col. 1 says: Based on faith & stable (*In fide fundati & stabiles*). To this also belongs the example of the thief on the cross, who is justified. But what does he have? Nothing, but solely faith in Christ, *solam fidem in Christ*. And could boast of no good work by which he could have attained salvation.

4. Thus we also see the use of Scripture, which has used and placed this word **alone** in the same way. When Moses says in Deuteronomy 6 [:13] that **thou shalt serve God**, Christ repeats in Matthew 4 thus [:10]: **Thou shalt serve him alone**. This example is particularly worthy of note. Mark 13 [:32] is in the Greek text: **But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son**, εἰ μὴ ὁ πᾶτερ **but the Father**. Luther did not give it according to the words, but according to the *phrasi* and *emphasi*, the emphasis and quality of the Greek language: **The Father alone**, for it is as much as if the little word *μόνος* alone had been there, as can be clearly seen from Matthew, who quotes this very passage in the 24th chapter thus [:36]: **But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not even the angels which are in heaven**, μὴ ὁ πατὴρ μου *μόνος nisi Pater meus solus*,

**but my Father alone.** The little word *μόνος*, *solus*, **alone**, is clearly there and yet means no more than it does in Mark, although Mark does not explicitly use the word *μόνος*, *solus*, **alone**.

5. Why did the papists in their papal Bible recognize this right in their 20th chapter of the 2nd book of Chronicles [12]? **We know not what we ought to do, but alone our eyes behold thee.** There the word alone in the Hebrew text is not sound, yet the papal Latin Bible has it, *solum*, precisely because the Hebrew values do not reject such a little word *solum*, but imply it.

For this reason our adversaries may not, with good reason and conscience, reproach Luther, because he translates it in such a way as the nature and characteristics of the language require, of which true Germans can and should judge, but not the Welsh, Spanish, French or the like. Whoever wishes to have a fuller account of this should, for God's sake, read the splendid, beautiful, detailed letter of the chosen man of God, which he wrote concerning this word, printed in the fifth part of his books at Jena, fol. 140, 141, 142, 143, which I will faithfully add from word by word at the end [p. 142 ff.]. Where a papist will refute this letter with reason, we will give way and say that the blessed Luther is wrong, but this will not happen, God willing, until there are 31 days in February. In the meantime, we persevere in the opinion that we are justified by faith and not by works, so that we may be assured of the salvation of our souls. As St. Paul writes to the Romans in chapter 4 [16]: **Therefore righteousness must come by faith, that it may be by grace, and that the promise may remain sure to all the seed.**

I realize that you hold that man should be assured of his salvation through his faith and not doubt.

Yes, I believe it is for the following reasons. Why are believers sealed with the Holy Spirit in their hearts? Of course, that they may remain firm, strong and immovable in the faith until the day of redemption. Ephesians 1 and 4, 2 Corinthians 1 Why are the holy sacraments used? Certainly for the strengthening of our faith,



for the assurance of our souls' salvation and blessedness. Hence the sacrament of circumcision is called a seal of the righteousness of faith, Romans 4 [:11]. Baptism a covenant of a good conscience with God, 1 Peter 3 [:21]. Why does Christ, in instituting the Most Holy Supper, say that the blood is given to us and shed for us for the remission of sins? Matthew 26 [:27-28]. Why did God forbid doubt in Scripture, even to the point of making God a liar, who promised to be our gracious God and Father? This is why Christ says in Matthew 14 [:31]: You of little faith, why do you doubt? Christ rebukes unbelief and doubt in John 4 when he says [:48]: **Unless you see signs and wonders, you will not believe.** Matthew 6 [:26]: **O ye of little faith, behold the fowls of the air.** James 1 [:6-8]: **Let him who prays not doubt, for he who doubts is like the wave of the sea driven and blown by the wind. Let not such a man think that he will receive anything from the Lord. A doubter is unstable in all his ways.** In 1 John 5 it says [:10]: **He who believes in the Son of God has the testimony with him. But he that believeth not the Son maketh him a liar.** But that faith casts out all doubt is evident from the passage in Hebrews 11, where it says [:1]: **Faith is a certain assurance of things hoped for, and not a doubting of things not seen.** Against which words of the holy apostle no sophistry can do anything, therefore the believing Paul triumphs thus to the Romans in the 8<sup>th</sup> chapter [:38-39]: **I am sure that neither death nor life, neither angels nor principalities nor powers, neither things present nor things to come, neither height nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.**

In the first epistle of John, chapter 3 [:14]: We know that we have come from death to life. There is no doubt everywhere.

David, Psalm 27 [:1]: **The Lord is my light and my salvation, of whom shall I be afraid? The Lord is the strength of my life, of whom shall I be afraid?**

Job is sure of his faith in chapter 19 [:25]: **I know that my Redeemer lives, and he will raise me up again from the earth, and in my flesh I will see him.**

1 John 3 [:2]: **We know that we are children of God, and that when he shall appear we shall be like him, and shall see him as he is.**

But is it not presumptuousness and spiritual arrogance?

Whoever therefore relies on his own works, on his own strength, is presumptuous and proud. But he who boldly against all the gates of hell relies on God's Word, on His promise, on the Holy Spirit, on the merit of Jesus Christ, is not presumptuous, but has faith and joy in the Spirit (Ephesians 3), **which bears witness to our spirit that we are children of God.** Romans 8 [:16] With this joy we can be humble and do all our works in faith, keeping ourselves from sinning, having God before our eyes and serving him with childlike fear and trembling. Psalm 2 [:11-12] If we do this, we have no cause to waver in our faith, but rather to be strengthened.

What is all this for?

It serves that we may know how to be eternally saved, and that we may beware of the errors of our adversaries, who pretend that we shall be justified and saved by our own stinking, unclean, imperfect works, who teach that we should doubt to the end whether we shall go to God or to the devil, to heaven or to hell. For the sake of which error everyone should beware of the papacy. You may misrepresent and embellish this doctrine as much as you like, but it is still against God and expressly punishes God with lies, as reported above.

Let this much be said from some sacred Scriptures about this highly important article for the time being, for it is not necessary to refute all the objections of the opponents. The simple-minded follow the advice of Luther, who says: Even if he could not refute all objections (although he has refuted them all), he would not consider the adversaries (sophistry) so worthy that he would therefore abandon the bright, clear truth, which is irrefutable and irrefutably contained in so many passages and places of Holy Scripture.

## The fourth article. [ToC](#)

# Of the invocation of the saints.

Is it true that the papists allow the invocation of the saints?

This does not require much questioning, experience bears witness to it. Do we not hear the saints invoked every day, is it not said in their litany: St. Michael pray for us, St. Augustine pray for us, all the holy martyrs, pray for us. How every country, every city, every faculty, every art, every disease had special saints in the papacy can be read in the Catechism of Dr. Polycarp Leyser, "Against the Papacy". Now I will only introduce one or two testimonies. A papal scribe, Caspar Schatzgeyer, writes thus: "The saints who reign with Christ in the fatherland are permitted to appeal to me very meritoriously, so that they may prove two kinds of good deeds to us. The first is that they represent us before God. The other, that they may help us either visibly or invisibly."

The Psalter of the Blessed Virgin Mary was printed in Venice by *Johannem de Hallis*, and subsequently reprinted in Paris and Leipzig, in which the Blessed Virgin is asked for the favors that King David asked of God. Among others are these words:

In you, most holy Virgin Mary, I trust, never let me be ashamed, receive me in your graces, incline your ears to me and rejoice in my sadness, you are my strength and my protection. I cried out to you when my heart was troubled and you heard me from the top of the eternal mountains. Into your hands, holy Mother of God, I commend my soul, my whole life and my last hour, etc... This is rightly called the saints, and those who live under the papacy know that this is all too true and all too common among the papists.

Is it wrong to invoke the departed saints?

If the invocation of the saints has no express basis in all sacred Scripture, it is easy to consider

that it is unjust. Now some of the papists themselves confess that this invocation of the saints is not expressly contained either in the Old or in the New Testament. Thus Eck, the well-known and distinguished papist, writes:

Explicite non est praecepta Sanctorum Invocatio in sacris literis: Non in veteri Testamento, ubi populus alioquin erat propensus in idololatriam: & Patres erant in Limbo, nondum Beati, Isa 63. Abraham nesciuit nos, & Israel ignoravit nos. Sub Evangelio etiam non fuit praeceptum, ne gentiles conversi, crederent se iterum induci ad cultum terrigenarum, ut pro veteri more, Sanctos, non ut Patronos, sed ut Deos adorassent. Sicuti Lycaoniae Paulo & Barnabae sacrificare volebant. Porro si Apostoli & Evangelistae docuissent Sanctos venerandos, arrogantiae datum eis fuisset, ac si ipsi post mortem, gloriam illam quae sivissent. Noluit ergo Spiritus St. Expressis Scripturis docere venerationem Sanctorum.

That is saying so much in German:

The invocation of the saints is not expressly commanded in the Holy Scriptures, not in the Old Testament; for there the people without were inclined to idolatry, and the fathers *in lydbo*, in limbo, were not yet saved. Isaiah on 63 [:16]: **Abraham knows nothing of us and Israel does not know us**. Nor was it commanded under the Gospel, lest the converted Gentiles should think that they were being led back to their former idolatry, that they were again invoking the saints according to their old custom, not as patrons and patron saints, but as gods, as they would sacrifice to Paul and Barnabas in the land of Lycaonia. Furthermore, if the apostles and evangelists had taught that the saints should be venerated, it might have been reckoned to them as an ambition, as if they had wanted and desired such honor after their death. Therefore, the Holy Spirit did not want to teach the invocation of the saints **with explicit words**. Up to this point Eck. We take it for granted.

Can other reasons be given to prove that the invocation of the saints is unjust?

This can be enforced with many and impressive reasons.

First of all, God commands us to worship him alone, to come to him. In the 6th chapter of the fifth book of Moses and the 4th chapter of Matthew [:10]: **You shall worship the Lord your God and serve him alone.**

In the 50th Psalm [:15]: **Call upon me in the time of trouble, and I will deliver you and you shall praise me.**

Joel 2 [:32]: **It shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.**

And Christ says in Matthew 11 [:28]: **"Come to me (not to the saints), all you who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.**

And how God is angered by the invocation of foreign gods can be seen from the following passage:

Jeremiah 2 [:5-13]: **What have your fathers lacked in me, that they have departed from me, and cleave unto idols? Go to the island of Chittim and send to Kedar, and see whether it is so there, whether the nations change their gods, though they are not gods. And my people change their holiness for a useless idol. Let the heavens be astonished, terrified and trembling. My people forsake the living fountain, and dig fountains that have holes and hold no water.**

Secondly, God alone hears, our prayer comes before him, our prayer is valid before him, not before the saints.

Psalms 141: **Lord, let my prayer be acceptable before you (not before the saints).**

Psalms 145 [:18]: **The Lord (not the saints) is near to all who call on him.**

Solomon in Proverbs, chapter 18 [:10-13]: **The name of the Lord is a stronghold; the righteous run to it (namely, to the name of the Lord, not of the saints) and are protected.**

Sirach in chapter 35 [:21-26]: **The prayer of the wretched penetrates the clouds and does not cease until it comes, and does not cease until the Most High (that is God, not the saints) sees it.**

Thirdly, we cannot call upon the departed saints, because they know nothing of us living ones in particular (*in specie*), as the people confess so clearly in the 64th chapter of Isaiah, where they say to God [*sic*: Isaiah 63:16]: **If you**

(God) **are our Father, Abraham knows nothing of us, and Israel (or Jacob) does not know us. But you, Lord, are our Father and our Redeemer, from ancient times this is your (not the saints') name.** In particular, because the prayer of the faithful is sometimes done in the heart with sighs, it is impossible for the departed saints to look into one's heart, for this is due to God alone. As it says in the 8th chapter of the first book of Kings [:39]: **Thou alone knowest the hearts of all the children of men, that they may fear thee always, as long as they live upon the earth.**

Fourthly, if we are to call on the saints, we must also believe in them. As St. Paul says to the Romans on the 10th [:14]: **How will they call on him in whom they do not believe?** Now the clever papists themselves consider it wrong that one should believe in the saints.

Fifthly, we are moved by the examples of Holy Scripture, since only God, only God, only God alone has been invoked. And although the saints were invoked, we read:

In the sixth place, that she does not tolerate such things, as is especially well exemplified in the 19th chapter of the Revelation of St. John. St. John falls down before an angel to worship him. The angel refuses such honor, saying to John [:10]: **See, do not do it. I am your fellow servant and of your brothers and those who have the testimony of Jesus.** What can be raised against this reason?

The Jesuits say that they call on the saints not as emergency helpers, but as mediators.

Let it be so, then, though the contradiction be worldly, yet it is wrong to think of the saints as mediators; for thus St. Paul says in the first epistle to Timothy, chapter 2 [:5]: **There is but one mediator between God and men, the man Jesus Christ.**

Some say they call on the saints as intercessors.

This expedient is just as useless as the previous one. Scripture points us only to one Advocate, Christ, and not to others, as it is written in the first epistle of John 2 [:1]: **If any man sin, we have an Advocate with**

**the Father Jesus Christ.** Rom. 8 [:34]: **Christ sits at the right hand of God and represents us.** And how are the deceased to be our advocates, since they themselves need an advocate, Jesus Christ?

Some say that they invoke the saints because of their merits, so that they may be heard.

This worship is even ungodly. Scripture instructs us that we should not base our prayers on the merit of our own works or those of the saints who have died, but solely on the mercy of God, on the name and merit of Jesus Christ. So it says in the 9th chapter of Daniel [:18]:

**We lie before you with our prayer, not for our righteousness, but for your great mercy.** Christ says, John chapter 14 [:13]: **If you ask anything in my name, I will give it to you.** And John 16 [:23]: **Truly, truly, I say to you, if you ask the Father anything in my name, he will give it to you.**

So this must be called false worship, if one prays in the name and merit of men, in the name and merit of the saints, as *S. Mariae*, *S. Petri*, *S. Pauli*, *S. Nicolai*, and the like.

The popes, to whitewash their invocation, say that God is too angry with us and therefore we must repay him through the saints.

That God is angry with impenitent sinners is not denied, but that the saints should appease the wrath of God is not; but only our Lord Christ Jesus, who is the Prince of Peace, who reconciles us to God. And let us now speak of the prayer of pious, penitent sinners, on whom God is not angry, but lavishes his grace upon them. This is why David says in Psalm 103 [:8-11]: **The Lord is merciful and gracious, patient and of great kindness; he will not always be angry, nor will he endure wrath forever. He does not deal with us according to our sins, nor repay us according to our iniquities; for as high as the heavens are above the earth, he shows mercy to those who fear him. As far as the morning is from the evening, he puts away our transgression. As a father has compassion on his children, so the Lord has compassion on those who fear him.**

In the 145th Psalm [:8]: **Gracious and merciful is the Lord, patient and of great kindness.**

God is not as grumpy as the grumblers want to make him out to be. This is why the epistle to the Hebrews in chapter 2 writes of Christ [:17]: **Therefore he had to become like his brothers in all things, so that he might become merciful and a faithful high priest before God, to make atonement for the sins of the people.**

But it is too much that Christ should always pray for us, he is far too high and glorious.

We certainly do not deserve this good deed of Christ, but Christ wants to show it to us and does not consider himself too worthy to make intercession for us. As it says in the epistle to the Hebrews in chapter 7 [:25]: **He is able to save forever those who come to God through him, and he lives forever and prays for them.**

St. Paul to the Romans in chapter 8 [:34]: **Who will condemn? Christ is here, who died; yea rather, who is also risen, who is at the right hand of God, and standeth for us.**

One must be afraid and shy to call on God at all times, but one is not so afraid of the saints.

It is no favor at all to the pious God if we have a servile fear and do not come to him as our father and brother with childlike trust. He wants us to call upon him and pray to him, even to knock on his door. This is why the epistle to the Hebrews on the 5th says [:15-16]: **We do not have a high priest who cannot sympathize with our weakness, but one who is tempted in all things like as we are, yet without sin. Therefore let us draw near with joy to the mercy seat, that we may receive mercy and find grace for the time when we need help.**

One may not come before worldly kings and princes oneself, but through their servants and counselors.

This is the use of the world, the use of man. But God is not like man. And Christ says, John 18 [:36]: **My kingdom is not of this world.**



And Luke 17 [:20]: **The kingdom of God does not come with outward appearances.** Therefore it is no wonder that things are much, much, much different in the kingdom of God than in the kingdom of men, with the heavenly prince than with the earthly prince.

Hosea 2 [sic: 11:9]: **I am God and not man.**

Isaiah 55 [:8]: **My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways.** But what God's thoughts are of true calling, he has revealed in His Word.

Absalom did not immediately come before the father, even though he was reconciled to him. So we too must come to Christ again through the saints.

This is just like the previous one. In the 15th chapter of Luke [:20] we read that the father himself runs to meet the prodigal son, and does not wait for the intercession of others. So it must not be that we allow ourselves to be interceded for by the saints; God himself runs to meet us, stretches out his hands and will graciously hear us.

Adonijah did not want to come to Solomon himself, but sent his mother first, who was set at the right hand of King Solomon. So we also send the mother of Christ first.

As I said before, I repeat it again: Christ Jesus does not make use of worldly princes, kings or lords, before whom they make much intercession. But before God there is only the intercession of Jesus Christ, and nothing else. Beyond this, Adonias did nothing through his mother. From this it would follow that nothing fruitful was accomplished through the mother of Christ either.

Luke 16 [:24]: The rich man addresses Abraham and not God.

Well, shall we now learn the form of prayer from the damned godless hellhound, the rich glutton? Is that so praiseworthy? What did the rich man accomplish with his request? Nothing anywhere. So we will also achieve nothing by invoking the saints.

How often are intercessions commanded to be made, 1 Timothy. 2, James 5, Rom. 15, Col. 4.

That the living should pray for the living is commanded in Scripture, and the passages quoted

refer to this. But that we should pray for the dead is not commanded. Because we are alive, we can pray for one another if we know their need. But when we have died, we can no longer help one another because we are not aware of our neighbor's needs, groans and concerns.

For it is often said in Scripture that the living worshiped one another, how much more shall we worship the saints in heaven?

I know very well what this objection is about. Scripture says of Abraham that he worshipped the Hittites, of Jacob that he worshipped Esau, of Nathan that he worshipped David, of Solomon that he worshipped his mother. But this is a *phrasis Hebraea*, a way of speaking in Scripture, which means as much as to humble oneself before someone, to do outward honor to someone, of which worship is not spoken in this article.

Is it right to honor the saints?

They are not to be worshipped, but they can be honored, so that their faith and good works may be praised and they may be followed, for the **righteous shall never be forgotten**, in the 112th Psalm [:6]. The epistle to the Hebrews, in the 13th chapter, refers to this with these words [:7]: **Remember your teachers, who have spoken the word of God to you, and follow their faith.**

Because one is not allowed to call upon the saints, one is much less allowed to call upon the images.

Of course, it should not be whether it already happens in the papacy. For thus it is written in the 20th chapter of the Exodus [:4-5]: **Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness, of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Do not worship them or serve them.**

In the third book of Moses in the 19th chapter [Leviticus 19:4]: **You shall not turn to idols, neither shall you make molten gods, for I am the Lord your God.**

In the first epistle to the Corinthians in chapter 10 [:14]: **Flee from idolatry.**

In the first epistle of John in chapter 5 [:21]: **Beware of idolatry.**

The popes say that they do not worship the images, but the one who is meant by the image.

This is contrary to public practice: if they do not worship the images themselves, why do they prefer to go to this image of Mary rather than to that image of Mary? In addition, it is not only wrong that they worship the image of Mary, but that they worship Mary, because the invocation is due to God alone, as has been previously reported and proven. But that it may be evident that the most distinguished papists themselves have publicly taught that the images are to be worshipped just as much as those indicated by the images, I will add one or two testimonies from their books:

*Thomas de Aquino*, who is one of the most distinguished, writes thus: *parte 3. q. 25. art. 3*:

Omnis imago est veneranda, sicut illud, cujus est imago. Cum ergo Christus adoretur adoratione Latriae, consequens est, quod ejus imago sit adoranda adoratione Latriae.

That is:

Every image is to be worshipped in the same way as the image of which it is made. If, then, Christ is worshipped with the worship due to the divine majesty alone, it follows that his image should also be worshipped with the same divine worship.

*Bonaventura super Sent. lib. 3. D. 9. Q. 2.* writes thus:

Quoniam ergo imago Christi introducta est, ad repraesentandum eum, qui pro nobis crucifixus est, nec offert se nobis pro se, sed pro illo, ideo omnis reverentia, quae ei offertur, offertur Christo, & propterea imagini Christi debet cultus Latriae exhiberi.

That is:

But **Christ's** image was introduced for this reason, to represent and present to us the one who was crucified for us, and does not present himself to us for himself, but for **Christ**, so that the reverence and devotion shown and offered to him is shown and offered to **Christ**. Therefore divine honor is due to the image of Christ, so that God himself may be honored.

What use is all this to me?

First, learn from this how you should pray rightly, namely, that you invoke God alone as your Giver and Father, that you invoke Jesus Christ alone as your Helper, your one Mediator and Advocate, that you worship him on His one merit. 2. Beware of the idolatrous prayers of the popes, who worship not only God, but also the saints next to him, and mute idols of wood and stone, who make their invocation not in the name of the one merit of Jesus Christ, but on their own merit and work, on their pilgrimages, on their fasting, their vows, their religious rules, and so on. Let what has been irrefutably said from God's Word so far confirm you against this.

**The fifth article.** [ToC](#)

## Of the Sacraments. of the New Testament, and how many of them there are.

What actually is a sacrament?

If you take the word sacrament more broadly, it is called a mystery, but we are talking here about the actual common interpretation.

And a sacrament is actually a work instituted by God himself, since the Almighty distributes his heavenly goods through certain external, visible elements mentioned in the word of institution, as a means by which we are promised forgiveness of sins and assurance of the eternal salvation of the soul, if we enjoy the sacraments in true faith and they are applied, given and appropriated to us according to God's foundation.

How many sacraments are in the New Testament?

Actually, there are only two sacraments to talk about: Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Just as there were only two in the Old Testament, circumcision and the paschal lamb. Which the old teachers and godly fathers took from the fact

that water and blood flowed from the side of Jesus Christ, and held that baptism was indicated by the water and the supper of Jesus Christ by the blood.

How many sacraments do the popes count?

They number seven: Baptism, the Last Supper, Confirmation, Absolution or Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony. The last five are not really sacraments of the New Testament, because they do not have all the properties that are necessary and extremely appropriate for a sacrament of the New Testament.

Which are the same properties?

The properties can and should be taken from Holy Baptism and Holy Communion, both of which are sacraments beyond all dispute, with us and the papists, that they are sacraments. Now the following passages are found in them:

First, just as Baptism and the Lord's Supper were not instituted and established by any man or angel, but by Almighty God Himself, so all the Sacraments of the New Testament must be instituted and established by Almighty God Himself.

Secondly, there must be two essential parts: an earthly part that is seen and a heavenly part that is not seen, for these are found in both sacraments: in Baptism, **the water and the Spirit**, and in the Lord's Supper, the **bread and body, wine and blood of Jesus Christ**.

Thirdly, the gracious promise of the forgiveness of sins is attached to the sacraments *in specie* and thus it happens in Baptism, Romans 6, Ephesians 5, Titus 3, and in Holy Communion, Matthew 26, Mark 14, Luke 22.

Fourthly, the sacraments are a *thesaurus solius Ecclesiae*, which are distributed only in the Church of God among those who profess and profess the faith of Jesus Christ, not among unbelieving peoples such as Jews or Turks, etc. Thus Baptism and the Lord's Supper are dispensed and distributed only among Christians; the Turks and Jews have neither in use.

Fifthly, they must be admitted to the use of all and every member of the

true Church after their foundation and institution. As can be seen from the two sacraments.

Sixth, the sacraments of the New Testament must be such that they differ in essentials from the sacraments of the Old Testament, since neither Baptism nor the Lord's Supper was in the Old Testament.

In the seventh place, the use of the sacraments must and should not be regarded as free, but as necessary, just as Baptism and Holy Communion should not be set aside.

To the eighth and last they can bear no fruit, nor be useful for eternal salvation, if faith is not present, as can be seen from the use of Baptism and the Holy supper. Nevertheless, the sacraments are complete, even without faith; the bread and the body, the wine and the blood make up the whole sacrament of the Lord's Supper; although the Lord's Supper does not benefit without the faith of the one who takes it, it is nevertheless complete without faith. *Sacramenta sine fide integra sunt, sed sine fide non prosunt.*

If a sacrament of the New Testament does not have all and each of these properties, then it cannot be considered a sacrament of the New Testament *proprie*, properly speaking, and therefore the other five sacraments of the popes are not true sacraments that could be compared to the two.

Could this not be explained in more detail?

It is not very necessary, but for the sake of the simple-minded I will examine the five papal sacraments mentioned and show in the briefest possible way that not all and every *requisita*, proper part can be assigned and attributed to them, which is why they are not held to be *sacraments proprie & stricte*, properly so called, such as Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

First of all, *Confirmation* is not a sacrament of the New Testament, because it has no basis in Holy Scripture, for where does it say in the Bible that oil was smeared on people's foreheads? that such oil was exorcized and that several legions of devils were cast out of the oil in the name of the Holy Trinity? Where does it say that Christians were given [good slaps in the mouth and cheek-strokes](#),

and that this action helped people more against the devil than Holy Baptism? There is not a single letter in the whole Bible and almost none of the eight passages mentioned can be attributed to this falsely named sacrament.

Penance likewise cannot be a sacrament of the New Testament, for it is not instituted for any sacrament, it has no visible elements ordained by God, it was also in the Old Testament, and without faith it is not complete, not to mention that in papal penance all kinds of errors about satisfaction through frugal contrition and suffering, all kinds of superstitions are included in the ceremonies.

The last anointing or unction is not a sacrament, because it is not dedicated to the sacrament of Christ, because it has no *substantialia*, essential parts mentioned and determined in God's Word, because it does not receive the special promise of the remission of sins, and because all kinds of abuses are involved in the papal ordination. Now I know very well that they want to whitewash this primarily from two passages in Holy Scripture. One is found in Mark 6 [:12]: They went out and preached that people should do penance, and cast out many devils, and anointed many sick people with oil, and healed them.

The other is written by James 5 [:14-16]: If anyone is sick, let him call to him the elders of the church and let them pray over him and anoint him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith will help the sick person, and the Lord will raise him up, and if he has committed sins, they will be forgiven him.

But these two passages do not help them at all, for none of them imply that anointing or unction should be considered a sacrament of the New Testament. Moreover, there is a great difference between apostolic and papal anointing. The former was not spared until a person was in the throes of death, but the latter is spared until the very end, when the soul is already on the tongue, as the saying goes. The former helped the sick to get well, but this papal one can help no one to keep alive. And since the apostolic gift of making the sick well has ceased altogether, it is certain that this papal ordination can and should not be passed off as a human poem and be regarded as a sacrament.

*Ordo*, the Orders [**Ordination**], is not a sacrament of the New Testament. 1. because it did not ask for an external *sacramental element* like the two sacraments. 2. Nor is there any promise of the forgiveness of sins attached to it. 3. And the holy office of preaching was also in the Old Testament. 4. It is bound to certain people, namely to clergy groups, since otherwise the sacraments of the New Testament are granted to the secular state as well as to the spiritual. 5. Not to mention that there are all kinds of ridiculous and abominable things in the papal order. Therefore even their own teachers cannot certainly and unanimously say that the order is *proprie*, properly a sacrament of the New Testament, as may be seen from *Bellarmino, Tom. 2. controvers. 4. lib. 1. c. 5. 6. 7. 8.*

Some of them put forward such arguments in order to prove that the Ordination is a sacrament, 1. because the office of preaching was instituted by God. Answer: The state of authority is also instituted by God, so it must follow that it is also a sacrament. 2. and because the holy office of preaching was also in the Old Testament, it is not a sacrament *proprie*, actually of the New Testament. Moreover, there is a great difference between the divine order of the sacred ministry of preaching and the papal order.

2. Furthermore, they prove their opinion thus: The order has an external element, namely the laying on of hands. Answer: The imposition of hands cannot be such an element as water, bread, wine, but is only a mere rite, use, and external *ceremonia*, which, though it is used in the New Testament, was never commanded and instituted by Christ as a perpetual *sacramental ceremonia*, but was a *libera ceremonia*, a free ceremony. And it is well to note that for a sacrament of the New Testament it is not enough to have one or two *requisites*, but the above-mentioned eight properties are to be found in each and every sacrament.

Finally, marriage cannot be considered a sacrament of the New Testament. For 1. there is no external element instituted by God. 2. there is no promise of the forgiveness of sins. 3. it would follow that the sacrament of the New Testament was also in the Old Testament, which is inconsistent. 4. And then the sacred sacraments would no longer be a *thesaurus*, a treasure



of the Christian churches, but would be found among the unbelieving Jews, Turks, and heathens, as well as among Christendom, which is especially abominable to hear. 5. How is it fitting that marriage should be a sacrament and yet, in the opinion of the popes, such a state that is not pleasing to God, as a carnal state? 6. And how have the papal clergy been so guilty that they may use all the sacraments without this? They must be convinced in their hearts that marriage is not a sacrament of the New Testament. Nevertheless, holy matrimony can be kept honest by everyone (Heb. 13), as an ordinance and endowment of God (Gen. 2), as well as the state of authority, and yet not be a sacrament.

From which it is clear as day to see how unfounded the doctrine of our adversaries is concerning the seven sacraments, since no more than two sacraments *proprie sic dicta*, properly so called, can be proved from sacred Scripture. Otherwise, if these things are all to be sacraments, such as baptism and the Lord's Supper, which are called sacraments in the Latin Bible, then the popes themselves know that not only seven, as they wish, but probably ten or more must be accepted. But here they can make a fine distinction between what is a sacrament, *proprie*, actually according to the nature of the two sacraments, and what is generally called and named a sacrament in common. All of which is useful to us for the confirmation of our doctrine and the prevention and refutation of the aforementioned errors.

## The sixth article. [ToC](#)

# Of the Holy Supper.

What is the sacrament of the Last Supper of Jesus Christ?

**I**t is the true body and the true essential blood of Jesus Christ, under and with the blessed bread and wine for us Christians to eat and drink here on earth, instituted by Christ Jesus himself. As

the holy evangelists Matth. 26, Mark 14, Luke 22 and the holy apostle Paul in the 1st epistle to the Corinthians in the 11th chapter testify.

What are the essential parts of this sacrament?

Two. Firstly, an earthly, visible one, as bread and wine, and secondly a heavenly, invisible one, which is nevertheless truly present here on earth, namely the true body and blood of Jesus Christ.

Are these two parts united?

By the first institution of the Lord Jesus Christ they are united in the use of the holy sacrament, so that I can truly say of the blessed bread **in its use and partaking** that it is a communion of the body of Christ. Of the blessed cup in the use administered, that it is a communion of the blood of Jesus Christ, as St. Paul says in his epistle to the Corinthians, chapter 10: And this is the result of the sacramental union.

How do you describe such a union?

So that it is a true union of the blessed bread with the body and the blessed wine with the blood of Christ, since by virtue of the first institution of Jesus Christ in the ordinary use and oral partaking of the holy sacrament, with bread and wine, the true body and the true essential blood of Jesus Christ is taken.

Is it not such a union, in that the bread is essentially changed into the body of Christ and the wine is likewise essentially changed into the blood of Jesus Christ?

No. Thus our adversaries teach of their *transubstantiation* and transformation of the earthly elements into the heavenly substance, as if after the blessing there were no more bread, no more wine, but only body, only blood. Indeed, the bread is no longer bread at all in its essence, but is transformed into the body of Christ.

This teaching is false. We teach from God's Word such a union of the bread with the body, of the wine with the blood, that in use the two parts are

inseparable, and neither the bread without the body, nor the body without the bread, are taken in proper use. But nevertheless, the two substances and essences should not be mixed and the bread should remain truly bread, the wine truly wine in its actual essence, thereby preventing a number of errors.

What kind of errors?

First of all, of the *transubstantiation* and transformation which the papists thus describe in their Council of Trent and elsewhere, that it is an essential transformation, whereby bread and wine are changed according to their essence into the essence of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, by saying the words: This is my body. Thus the essence of the bread and wine is made void, and apart from the mere taste and outward appearance there is nothing of the bread or wine.

How do you refute this fallacy?

1. From this, because it has no solid ground in all the Scriptures, which some of our adversaries themselves must confess.

2. It is undeniable that this transformation was finally commanded by the Pope in the [Concilio Lateranensi, about 300 years ago](#).

3 St. Paul, in the first epistle to the Corinthians in chapter 10 [:16];, calls the blessed bread and the blessed cup a communion of the body and blood of Jesus Christ. If the bread is to be a communion of the body of Christ, then the bread must remain bread, so that it may be the communion of another, namely the body of Jesus Christ. The words of the holy apostle Paul are thus [:16]: **The blessed cup which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ, and the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?** For further explanation, consider this example: the water that is turned into wine at Cana cannot be a communion of wine, but is wine because it is turned into wine. And so, if the bread were changed into the body, it could not be a communion of

the body, but the body itself, and so the body would be a communion of the same body, which is unheard of in all the world.

4. St. Paul also refutes this transformation in that, after the bread has been blessed, he still calls the blessed bread, and that often, as can be seen in the first epistle to the Corinthians in chapters 10 and 11: But if after the blessing the bread were no longer bread, or were essentially changed into the body, then the apostle should not say who eats the bread, but who eats the body, because according to the papist opinion it is not bread that is eaten, but only the body without the bread. Which is so clearly and obviously contrary to the words of Scripture, where it is said: We truly eat a true bread, and with the bread we truly eat the true body of Jesus Christ.

5. Christ says: In the holy supper we eat the body that was given for us at the foot of the cross. But if this papal transformation is valid, then we do not eat the body of Christ, but that which was transformed from the bread and only created through the words of institution.

6. But how can the article on the incarnation of Jesus Christ undergo such a transformation? We believe and confess that Christ Jesus assumed his true flesh and blood **only once** in the body of the Blessed Virgin Mary. But because of the papal transubstantiation, the body and blood of Jesus Christ must be made and created from the bread and wine at all times and many thousands of times, which is why the popes call themselves *Creatores Creatoris*, Creators of the Creator, in a booklet called [\*Stella Clericorum\*](#), who create and make the Lord Jesus Christ anew, and say: They are more glorious than St. Mary, who would have made Christ only once. Mary, who would have given birth to Christ only once, but they, the sacristans, can make him new every day and thus create the Creator, which is indeed very blasphemous to hear. For in this way not only one body of Jesus Christ is formed, which is conceived in the body of the Blessed Virgin Mary through the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit, but another is introduced, which is made by the sacristans through the transformation of a loaf of bread. Who will accept this as a sound doctrine?

Why did Christ say: "This bread is my body"?

Christ did not use this way of speaking, but said: **Eat, this is my body**. For that which I give you with the bread is my body. And that is why St. Paul did not mean to say: The bread is the body of Christ, but the bread is the communion of the body of Jesus Christ. Much less does the Bible say: This bread is essentially transformed into the body of Christ. And even if Christ had said, "The bread is my body," it would not be concluded that the bread is transformed into the body, just as it does not follow from this statement that God is man that God is transformed into humanity, but rather that God is man through union without transformation. Thus in use the blessed bread is the body of Jesus Christ through union without all transformation, and just as God remains God, humanity remains humanity, unmixed, unmingled, yet united, so that God is truly man, thus bread remains bread, the body of Jesus Christ remains body, both unmixed, unmingled: but united through the institution of Jesus Christ, so that the bread is not taken without the body, the body not without the bread in the holy supper.

But it is possible for God to transform the bread into the body.

There is no doubt about that. The question is not whether God can do it, but whether he wants to do it. God could have instituted other sacraments, but he did not want to. God could have let the Last Day come a thousand years ago, but he did not want to. God could have given the Turkish emperor the Roman Empire, but he did not want to and hopefully will never want to. That is why the Psalm says [**Psalms 135:6**]: **Whatever He wills, He does in heaven and on earth**. God does not do all that He can, but all that He wills.

Couldn't their own teaching be used to refute them in this article?

This is quite possible. John Gerson, who was a distinguished and learned man, in giving reasons why the laity should not be given the cup, says, among other things, that there is a danger that the wine will spoil and turn into vinegar. What do I hear there? If the sacrament still contains real wine, what do they teach about the transformation, but if it is all blood, how can the blood of Jesus

Christ be corrupted? How can it become vinegar? Dear God, who hath fear, and seest not the vanity of this doctrine? From which all may hear how *transubstantiation* or transformation is not only without Scripture, but also contrary to Scripture. And if Christian hearts are asked for God's will, they will not allow themselves to be persuaded or duped by the Jesuits with their objections, but rather take heed of what St. Paul commands in the first epistle to Timothy in the 6th chapter [:20]: *De vita oppositiones falso nominatae scientiae*, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called. What more follows from this transformation, what errors arise from it, we will soon hear.

## The seventh article. [ToC](#)

# On Reserving, Enclosing, Adoration of the Sacrament.

Is the Lord's Supper also a sacrament apart from its use?

By no means. Therefore is the papal doctrine and usage of the reserving and enclosing of the sacrament entirely false and erroneous for the following reasons:

1. Nowhere in sacred Scripture is it said that the sacraments are sacraments apart from their use. What is not founded in the Word of God cannot be accepted as an article of faith.

2. Christ Jesus says: **This do**. He does not say: Reserve it, but He says **eat and drink**. When you eat, you eat my body; when you drink, you drink my blood. And so partaking has become a sacrament and attached to it, which no one can tear away, much less change and transform. Whoever does not eat the blessed bread or drink the blessed cup, but encloses it in a

monstrance and keeps it, does not have the sacrament, does not have the Lord's Supper, which Christ did not enclose, did not keep, but appointed to be eaten and drunk. Let this be well remembered. Hence the old rule: There is nothing outside the use of the Sacrament (*Nihil extra usum habet rationem Sacramenti*).

3. If the sacrament of the Lord's Supper remains a sacrament apart from its use, why does not Baptism also remain a sacrament apart from its use? There can be no thorough reason for the inequality.

If the Lord's Supper were not a sacrament apart from its use, it would follow that it is not Christ's Word but our use that makes the sacrament.

This does not follow at all, but everything is attributed to the institution and the words of Jesus Christ. He has thus ordained that under the bread he would give his **body to be eaten**, not to be retained, and under the wine his **blood to be drunk**, not to be retained. Indeed, if we were to say of ourselves that our use and enjoyment must be involved, it would be wrong. But because Christ Jesus Himself has thus instituted and ordained it, it must remain so and does not prevent us from doing what others have done against and without God's order in this case.

Is it right to worship the Lord's Supper in and out of use?

If the errors described were correct, then this worship would also be correct. But since it has so far been sufficiently proved: 1. that there is not only body and blood, but also bread and wine in the Holy Sacrament, 2. that there is no sacrament at all apart from its use, it is clear and evident that a great error and abominable idolatry is committed by the invocation of the sacrament. For, of course, if the whole sacrament is invoked, the bread and wine must also be invoked, which is idolatrous, even if it is done in use; but even more so outside of use, since there is no body and blood present, or under the hosts, under the wine. And we have no commandment to adore the sacrament in use, much less apart from use. Whom I invoke, in Him I believe, in Him I must believe. But I do not believe in the sacrament, whether I already believe that it is a sacrament. Just as I believe

that there is a communion of saints and yet do not believe in the communion of saints. Therefore I cannot and should not worship the sacrament, not to mention that in all of evangelical history it is not even thought that the apostles or others worshipped the sacrament. We do worship Christ Jesus in the sacrament, but not the sacrament itself; for the sacrament is not Christ alone, but bread and wine also belong to it, as has been shown many times.

Where Christ is, there he is to be worshipped. But he is in the bread, therefore he is there to be worshipped.

This objection is cunning, but can easily be refuted. According to papal opinion, it is not true that where Christ is, he is to be worshipped everywhere. He is in us, dwells in us together with the Father and the Holy Spirit, John 14 [:17]. In the second epistle to the Corinthians, chapter 6 [:16]. Therefore it does not follow that he is to be worshipped in us, therefore he is to be worshipped where he has declared himself to be worshipped and how he has declared himself to be worshipped in the Word.

Then there are two different questions: 1. Whether Christ is to be worshipped in the sacrament? We say: Yes. 2. Whether the sacrament is to be adored? Here we say: No. Christ is invoked in the use of Holy Communion to make us worthy to receive his body and blood fruitfully and to proclaim his death. But the sacrament, which contains not only the body and blood of Christ, but also bread and wine, cannot and should not be worshipped.

But since the body of Christ is united with the bread, why should we not also worship the bread with the body?

Precisely because God, Christ, did not order and command it in this way. If the Holy Spirit was not truly, actually united with the dove, why was it not permitted to worship the dove with the Holy Spirit? The union is to be taken no further than Christ himself has commanded, who meant it for enjoyment and not for worship. That the bread should be sacramentally united with the body of Jesus Christ is not contrary to God's Word or some articles of faith, but that the bread should be worshipped is contrary to God's Word and our faith. We believe in God and not in bread, therefore we call on our God and not on bread.



Can you give another reason to prove that one is not guilty of adoring the sacrament, even though Christ is present there with his body and blood?

Yes, and this is a reason that our adversaries cannot overturn. In the sacrament of Holy Baptism, the whole Holy Trinity is present in the water, for it is not an evil water, but a holy water in use, a divine water. Nevertheless, the sacrament of baptism is not worshipped. God, the Holy Trinity, who is present at baptism, is indeed worshipped, but not baptism itself. So it is the same with this sacrament. Christ Jesus, who is present in the Holy Supper with his body and blood, we worship, but not the Supper itself; for just as in the sacrament of Baptism there is something more than God, namely the Word and water, which are not worshipped, so also in the Holy Supper there is not only the body and blood of Christ, but the words and the earthly elements, as bread and wine, which we are not commanded to worship either in the use of the sacrament or apart from its use. It therefore follows irrefutably that our opponents are truly committing idolatry when they worship the sacrament, for it is eternally certain that not only the body and blood, but also the bread and wine are in the sacrament.

## **The eighth article. [ToC](#)**

# **On the Feast of Corpus Christi.**

What kind of feast is this?

Words cannot describe it enough. Those who are in the papacy know well what a procession is held with the supposed *Sacramento*, the Thursday after the feast of the Holy Trinity, namely that the supposed body of Christ is enclosed in a stately golden monstrance and carried around the city, in front of which the people fall down, many thousands of people tend to go along, especially all

craftsmen with their own flags, with their own music. From the alleys the earth is decorated with greenery, the walls with trees. Altars are erected at several houses where mass is held. The noblest gentlemen walk with lighted torches, all the clergy in order with their ghastly bawling and shouting. Soon they begin to ring all the bells, soon to shoot. and what is more. [Such a festival](#) is not old, but quite new; since, as the popes themselves confess, Pope Urbanus IV. Urbanus IV instituted it in 1264 for the following reason: even before he became pope, Urbanus had a dear, good, faithful friend, named Evam, a nun. She claimed that she had received a vision and that it had been revealed to her that an annual feast of Corpus Christi should be held in the church, and she brought this before her most beloved Pope Urbano, who, out of special affection for his dear, faithful nun Evam, immediately instituted and ordered such a feast, not thinking of the words of St. Paul [[1 Corinthians 14:34](#)]: I do not permit a woman to speak in the church. And so this feast is not founded in God's Word, but in a fictitious, or even evil, face of the nun Eve, from which anyone can easily conclude what is to be thought of in this feast.

I would like to have a number of reasons to prove that this festival is not Christian.

If you look at the action and the plot properly, it is easy to see that this festival is neither Christian nor acceptable.

1. As previously reported, it is not from God, but from the nun Eva.

2. Thus the Lord's Supper is completely abused with the enclosure in the monstrance and with the transfer, which Christ did not command in the institution.

3. Much less can one worship the same monstrance in a Christian manner and pay divine homage to it.

4. Even in the time of the apostles this was not customary, and not a word of it can be found in St. Paul.

5. Nor is it to be argued that such processions were customary in the first pure church, but were only introduced in the year of Christ 1264.

6. A shameful simony (*simonia*) and new indulgences are introduced without and against God's commandment, for Urbanus, the founder, granted indulgences for forty-four and a half days to those who not only attended the feast but also watched it. So they had to put bacon in the mousetrap for the blind people so that they would be caught.

Is the holy sacrament not worthy of a certain feast in its honor?

It is well worthy, indeed it is worthy of all honor, for which reason the Christian Church celebrates an annual feast on Green Thursday [Maundy Thursday] in honor of this reverend sacrament, not with adoration of the sacrament, but that one invokes Christ Jesus together with the Father and the Holy Spirit, and also thanks Christ that he instituted such a holy sacrament for our good. His death is proclaimed and his commandment obeyed when he says: Eat, drink, which is omitted in the papal feast of Corpus Christi. The question is not whether this holy sacrament should be honored, who denies that? But whether it should be venerated in the papal, Persian, idolatrous way, we say no, until our adversaries show that it has sufficient foundations.

Their most important reason is this: Because the transfer of the ark of the covenant is pleasing to God, even though he did not command it, the transfer of this sacrament cannot displease God.

There is a big difference between the Ark of the Covenant and this feast. Where was the ark of the covenant worshipped as this sacrament is worshipped? Where was the ark of the covenant held for a god, like the monstrance in this papal feast? Where have so many indulgences been granted for the transportation of the Ark of the Covenant? Where have sacrifices been made in the streets during the procession? And how does the ark of the covenant rhyme with the feast of Corpus Christi? But just as we read in the fourth chapter of the first book of Samuel: That God was displeased with the carrying away of the ark, that all Israel was put to death and put to flight, the priests also killed, and finally the ark itself was taken by enemies, because they brought the ark into the camp without God's command and placed their salvation on it as they saw fit. In the same way, the

papal monstrance may one day have an outcome that is much less pleasing to God than the removal of the ark. That is why God proclaimed this abomination through the holy prophet Daniel, chapter 12, with the words [:38]: He will honor a god, of whom his fathers knew nothing, with gold, silver, precious stones and jewels, and will do great honor to those who help him strengthen *Mausim* (the mass) with the foreign god whom he asked to be mentioned, and will make them lords over great possessions and give them the land as a reward. Let each one go into his conscience, take experience as a guide, and see whether all this does not come to pass and be fulfilled in fact and truth at this feast. Therefore our counterparts should be ashamed in their hearts to gloss over this feast or to blame our (truly) Catholic Church for avoiding it. But they say: *Furor arma ministrat*, help what may help.

## The ninth article. [ToC](#) Of the Mass.

What is the main dispute in this article.

**T**his is the main controversy, whether the Holy Supper is a true outward sacrifice of atonement, in which the body of Jesus Christ is offered to the heavenly Father for the living and for the dead, which the popes say, but we can by no means accept such a sacrifice.

For what reasons?

1. Since in the institution of the Holy Supper Christ Jesus instituted not a sacrifice but a sacrament, it is not proper for us to change Christ's order.
2. Nor is there any word to be found in which the Lord Christ instituted such sacrifices.
3. The Scripture knows of only one atoning sacrifice, of one trespass offering, namely the suffering and death of Jesus

Christ, Heb. 10 [:12]. With **one sacrifice** he has perfected, for eternity, those who are sanctified.

4. The mass is said and repeated so often, but what is repeated so often cannot be a sacrifice, as can be seen in the same 10th chapter of Hebrews, where it says [:1]: Every year one must always offer one kind of sacrifice, and cannot make those who offer perfect, otherwise the sacrifice would have ceased. Every priest is ordained to worship every day and often to offer the same sacrifice, which can never take away sin. But he (Christ) offered **one sacrifice** for sin, which endures forever. This is the difference between the sacrifice of Jesus Christ and the sacrifices of the Old Testament, that the former happened only once, while the latter happened often and many times.

5. If Christ had been offered up in the Mass and had offered himself to God in the Holy Supper, he would not have been offered only once, but at least twice, once in the sacrament, the other time on the cross. But this is clearly contrary to Holy Scripture, which testifies that the Lord Christ offered Himself **only once**. As we read in Hebrews 9 [:1], where it says: At the end of the world he appeared **once** to take away sin by his own sacrifice. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: So Christ was **once offered** to take away much sin. So it cannot be that Christ sacrificed himself again in the Lord's Supper, or that he did not have to sacrifice himself on the cross, which no Christian will say.

6. Because there is no shedding of blood in the Mass, the Mass cannot be a sacrifice that expiates sin. For so it says again in Hebrews 9 [:22]: **Without the shedding of blood there** is no forgiveness of sins.

7. As often as Christ is sacrificed, so often must he suffer, is written in the 9th chapter of Hebrews, verse 26. Now he suffered only once, he died once, dies and suffers no more, Romans 6 [:10]. From this it also follows irrefutably that he is not offered up in the Mass.

8. Did the Lord Christ institute the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, not for the dead, but for the living, for those who can still eat, still drink, still

speak, proclaim the Lord's death, and test themselves? The Mass, however, is to be a sacrifice for the deceased, which does not correspond with the institution of the Lord Christ.

9. Too much haggling and profiteering is done with the mass, the poor people are shamefully cheated of their money, which they give for the papal mass, since otherwise these spiritual gifts, as forgiveness of sins etc., are not sold for the money, as can be seen in Acts 8 [:20].

10. There are many errors in the Mass, many vain, ridiculous, and useless things, all of which are added to Holy Communion with great sacrilege, such as making a sacrifice out of a sacrament, greatly reducing and diminishing the Lord Christ's atoning sacrifice, that they devise a forgiveness of sins without the shedding of blood, that they use all kinds of *gesticulations* and ridiculous offerings, sometimes pretending to be asleep, sometimes bowing down, sometimes mumbling secretly, sometimes shouting loudly, and other such ridiculous and useless offerings. But especially the *Canon Missaticus* or the prayers that are said at Mass are extremely blasphemous and against Christ Jesus, for they pray that God would be as pleased with this sacrifice of the body and blood of Jesus Christ as with the sacrifices of Abel and Melchizedeck. Is Christ out of favor with God the Father so that the papal priests must first plead with the Father on his behalf? Must not the Lord Christ be more acceptable to the Father than the sacrifice of Abel, which may have been a little lamb? Indeed, if this prayer is to be valid, then Christ does not have to please God at all, because they pray that he should please him, like the sacrifice of Melchizedeck. Because there is no Melchizedeck sacrifice in the Bible, it could not have been pleasing if there had been none. More subtly, they ask God to command the angels to bring the body of Christ before his face. What is that? I thought that Christ did not need the angels to help him into heaven first, for he is the Lord of heaven, he is first in heaven, he is first with, yes, in the heavenly Father, John 14: I thought that Christ went to heaven only once and never departed from his Father. What then may the angels first bring him to the Father? Or does Christ perhaps have two bodies? One that ascended to heaven

in the person of the Word, the other that the angels take to heaven in the Mass? Such and more such abominable errors are all found in a heap in the papal Mass.

11. In the eleventh place, there are many *contradictions* in the Mass, many repugnant doctrines and speeches, for how is it possible that the Mass should be a true sacrifice, namely a propitiatory sacrifice without blood? Has this ever been heard? The Mass should be a visible sacrifice, and what is sacrificed cannot be seen. Christ is sacrificed and yet imperfectly for the sin of the world, which is all against each other. Our adversaries are still so blind that they do not see such abominations.

They say: The Mass has always been in use and Luther himself confesses it.

In the Apology of the Augsburg Confession we clearly confess that there has always been a Mass in the Christian Church, but it does not follow from this that the papal Mass has been in use for so long that one should be careful about what we mean by the word Mass, namely Holy Communion, as it has always been held in the Catholic Church with Christian ceremonies. This has always been the case, but the popes mean something else by the Mass, namely their supposed sacrifice, of which they cannot say with reason of truth, even if they do say it, that it has always been in the Church of God. For *Bellarminus*, one of the most distinguished Jesuits, proves that 800 years after the birth of Christ the Mass was first held with the ceremonies as it is now. Although he has now added many false things, it is nevertheless to be concluded that he did not dare to say, as others do, that the Mass has always been held in this way from the institution of Christ to the present time, which Pope *Gregory Magnus*, the first of this name, in Regist. 7th book, 63rd chapter, and the papal *Historicus Platina*, speaking of the life of [Sixtus the First](#), testify and clearly state that the sacrament was previously observed in a simple and Christian manner, until now one after another has forged and set more to it. If the popes themselves confess this, with what conscience may some of them write publicly that the papal Mass has always been customary in the Church of Christ,

as it is now in the papacy, which is called too much of the truth.

The paschal lamb in the Old Testament was a sacrifice, but the sacrament of the Holy Supper, which was signified by the old paschal lamb, was soon substituted for the old paschal lamb, which is why it is a sacrifice as well as that one.

Answer: 1. Nowhere in sacred Scripture is the paschal lamb actually called a sacrifice, nor a propitiatory sacrifice. For the same sacrifices had to be offered by the priests alone, on the altar alone, with certain ceremonies. This paschal lamb, however, was not only sacrificed by priests, but also by all the householders, and not on the altar alone, but through all the houses, in all the houses, with many other ceremonies than those used in the sacrifice of atonement. In the eighth chapter of Exodus [:26] it says that no sacrifice could be offered in Egypt because of the abominations of Egypt, but because the paschal lamb was slaughtered in Egypt, it must follow that it was not a real sacrifice, and it does not help to prove from the mere slaughter that the paschal lamb was a sacrifice, since it was not slaughtered for sacrifice but for food.

2. The sacrament of Holy Communion was not actually signified by the paschal lamb, but by Christ Jesus, who was to be slain for us on the cross as an innocent lamb. Isaiah 53, 1 Cor. 5.

3. And although the sacrament of the Holy Supper succeeded the paschal [or Easter] lamb and was instituted in its place in the New Testament, it does not follow that the new sacrament is of the same kind as the old. If the paschal lamb had been sacrificed in the Old Testament, it would not follow that Christ was also sacrificed in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, because this sacrament came in place of the old. Otherwise it would also have to follow that Baptism came instead of circumcision; therefore, just as in the circumcision of the Old Testament the foreskin was circumcised, so also in Baptism there must be circumcision, and if this is true, I cannot finely press the popes in this way. In the paschal lamb the sacrifice was made with the shedding of blood, so it must follow that in the Mass the sacrifice should also be made with the shedding of blood, but this does not happen,



what do they want to say about this? Therefore, it is safest to believe and know that the pascal lamb in the Old Testament was a type of the Easter lamb in the New Testament, which was slaughtered on the trunk of the cross, and not a type of the sacrifice of the Mass.

They say that Christ on the cross is not the pascal lamb indicated, because no meal would have been performed there, but the old pascal lamb would have been eaten.

They evidently say against Scripture, which confesses that Christ on the cross is signified by the pascal lamb, Isaiah 53, and especially John 19. In the first epistle to the Corinthians 5 [:7], concerning eating: Although the slain Christ Jesus is not eaten bodily, as the lamb was eaten in the Old Testament, yet by faith he is eaten spiritually, which Scripture also calls eating. John 6: I speak of the passion of Jesus Christ as it is eaten, not of the body in the holy sacrament, which we eat spiritually, but also orally. This objection of ours to the contrary is of no avail, although it is already held in high esteem by them.

As, however, when Christ is slaughtered in the mass, *incruento modo*, bloodlessly, because otherwise one would not have been able to eat Christ if he had not been slaughtered, just as in the Old Testament one could not eat an un-slaughtered lamb.

So our adversaries pretend, but very inconsistently. For where do they always want to prove that Christ was slain in the Mass, slain in the Lord's Supper in an unbloody manner? Is there even a single letter of this in the whole of Scripture? How often was Christ slain? The Scriptures say only once, and the papists say twice, first in the sacrament, and secondly on the stem of the cross. Are we then to abandon God's Word? But the fact that they pretend that otherwise Christ could not have been eaten if he had not been slain shows what coarse, carnal, capernaiaic thoughts they have in their heads about partaking of the sacrament. Do you think, you papists, that the eating of the body of Jesus Christ in Holy Communion is like the eating of the pascal lamb in the

Old Testament? God forbid, and what need is there to eat the body of Christ in the same way as the old paschal lamb? Now that we have been freed from the Jewish ceremonies, we would have to use bitter salt and other things and be girded with belts around our loins. But I ask, if Christ sacrificed himself for sin in the Lord's Supper, why did he sacrifice himself again for sin at the foot of the cross? Where is the word of Scripture that he was sacrificed **only once**, that he redeemed us eternally from sin only **through one sacrifice**, which is written so often in the epistle to the Hebrews.

The church is visible and must have visible things so that it may be strengthened in its faith.

It does not follow from this that the Mass is precisely the visible means of help. Let us stick to the means which Christ Jesus has instituted for us, namely the sacraments, which are also visibly administered and distributed. But since the popes want so much to insist on this argument, one can justifiably counter them with this objection: All sacrifices of the Old Testament were such that what was sacrificed was also seen. If, then, the Mass is a true, outward sacrifice, it must follow that what is offered can be seen.

But now, according to their pretense, the body of Jesus Christ is sacrificed, which is not seen or felt. And so they have no really visible sacrifice in the Mass. They should probably leave this argument unresolved; they must not come up with the bread and wine, for they themselves confess that they do not offer bread and wine, but the body of Jesus Christ.

Is there supposed to be no sacrifice at all in the New Testament? After all, the Scriptures commemorate sacrifice several times.

The Scriptures commemorate it, yes, but in eternity it will not be found that such a papal sacrifice of the Mass is commemorated, that is so certain, as God is God, but other sacrifices are mentioned with clear letters, as:

1. The atoning sacrifice which Jesus Christ made at the foot of the cross. Hebrews 9 and 10.

2. The ministry of the gospel is also called a sacrifice. Romans 15 [:16-17], where St. Paul writes thus: I am to be a minister of Christ among the Gentiles, to offer the gospel of God, that the Gentiles may become a sacrifice acceptable to God, sanctified by the Holy Spirit. Not only the gospel, but also the Gentiles are called a sacrifice in an oblique way. As also Philippians 2 [:17].

3. The prayers of the saints are called incense and sacrifices in Revelation, chap. 5 and 8, and in many other places.

4. When praise is given to God and shared with the poor, this is called a sacrifice in Scripture. To Hebrews 13 [:15-16], where it says, Let us therefore through him offer the sacrifice of praise to God always, which is the fruit of lips that confess his name. Do not forget to do good and to share, for such sacrifices are pleasing to God.

5. If one leads a Christian life, the Scripture also means this to be a sacrifice pleasing to God. So St. Paul writes to the Romans, chapter 12 [:1]: I beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. But that Holy Communion should ever be called a sacrifice in Holy Scripture cannot be proved for all eternity.

Our opponent endeavors to force from the 13th chapter of the Apostolic Histories [Acts 13:2] that the apostles sacrificed; the text thus reads: And as they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Spirit spoke, etc. Oh, what a ridiculous proof! Can the Lord not be served in any other way than with the sacrifice of the Mass? Can he not be served with prayer and preaching? Must not the word λειτουργειν **serve**, as it is used here, mean something other than holding Mass? St. Paul, who uses the very word here, not for sacrificial Mass, but for the ministry of the Holy Gospel, says that he is a λειτουργός a servant of Jesus Christ among the Gentiles, etc.

To conclude from this irrefutably how the little word λειτουργειν must not be understood of the holding of mass, and I would like to know, because it is said by many, since they served the Lord, whether the popes think that many masses were forged at that time? They can offer no reason at all.

In the Church of God the word *liturgia* was first used for the office of the Church, for the action of Holy Communion, until finally the Romanists applied it to their invented sacrifice, like the word Mass. In sum, it remains the same: λειτουργειν, to **serve**, must not nevertheless mean to hold Mass, as only with the popes, otherwise not, neither in Scripture, nor elsewhere.

Nevertheless, the Most Blessed Sacrament has always been called a sacrifice by the Fathers and the Church.

Answer: 1. Is that certain? In the Scripture it is not called a sacrifice, much less a sacrifice of the Mass. 2. As to the Fathers and Churches, we confess that they have at times called Holy Communion a (*sacrificium*) sacrifice, but not such a sacrifice as the Mass, but in the manner in which preaching, praying, and almsgiving are called a sacrifice, and the holy Fathers in the first pure Church saw the word sacrifice chiefly from this: 1. because all divine services in general can be called in Latin sacrificia, & facienda sacra. 2. because of the prayers which are performed in this holy sacrament, as the right sacrifices of the mouth, the right sacrifices of praise. (Heb. 13 [:15]) 3. because of the alms which were offered in times past from the first fruits of the sacrament. This is what they meant by the word sacrifice in this sacrament, but that the holy pure Fathers should have regarded the Lord's Supper as such a propitiatory sacrifice as the Mass is, can never be presented with truth. The Fathers used the word sacrifice loosely (*abusive*), and *metaphorically*; the popes use it *proprie*, even properly, as the word sacrifice is otherwise taken; that is a great difference. Finally, if they will not stop with the writings of this or that ancient Father, we say that it is not enough to prove that this or that one called the Lord's Supper a sacrifice, but that Jesus Christ considered his sacrament

a sacrifice. We have come to Jesus, of whom the heavenly Father says [**Matthew 3:17**]: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, him you shall hear. Therefore let us say, as St. Paul says to the Romans in chapter 15 [**:18**]: So I must not speak unless Christ works through me.

Because Christ is an eternal high priest, he must also have an eternal sacrifice.

Answer: The holy sacrifice which he offered to his heavenly Father at the foot of the cross is and remains eternal as far as its power and effect are concerned, even if it is offered only once. And the Lord Christ remains a high priest forever, not because of the Mass, that he must always be offered up, but for other reasons which Scripture indicates:

1. because he remains forever.
2. because he is able to save forever those who come to God through Him.
3. because he lives forever and prays for us, as is expressly stated in the epistle to the Hebrews in chapter 7 [**:23-28**]: Many of those became priests because death would not let them remain, but this one, because he remains forever, has an everlasting priesthood, therefore he can also save forever those who come to God through him, and he lives forever and prays for them.

But that he would still have to sacrifice because of his priesthood is nowhere attested in Scripture. Nor is it true that Christ performs his priesthood in this way in the Mass, because in the Mass it is not He who offers himself to the Father, but the sacrificer. But away with such erroneous teachings. We know from the Word of God that Christ did not want to sacrifice himself more than once, as it says in the epistle to the Hebrews in chapter 9 [**:25-26**]: Not that he (Christ) should offer himself **often**, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with strange blood: otherwise he must needs have suffered often from the beginning of the world. But now, at the end of the world, he has appeared **once** to take away sin by his own sacrifice.

We leave it at that in Christian simplicity, asking God not to let us deviate from His Word.

Nevertheless, much good is still found in the Mass and the suffering of Jesus Christ is commemorated in it, so the Mass need not be rejected outright?

Answer: Yes, if there were only good things in the Mass, they should not be rejected. We do not condemn the *Kyrie*, the *Hallelujah*, the *Gloria in excelsis* and other Christian things, even if these good things are included, they do not make the Mass good, which can be deduced from a likeness. In sorcery, good things are also healthy, namely the name of the Holy Trinity, this name in itself remains good, but the sorcerer is not good because he abuses this noble, holy name and mixes in other cursed, damned things. So the aforementioned parts in the Mass are also good. The name of Jesus and His remembrance are good, but there are several things in the Mass, namely the idolatrous invocation of the saints, the blasphemies mentioned above, that the priest intercedes for Christ before the heavenly Father, and the most atrocious thing of all, that the holy, sacred sacrament is changed into such a sacrifice, that Christ is so often (supposedly) sacrificed by the sacristan with his highest dishonor and bought with money from the people, which cannot be glossed over or disguised with the *Kyrie* and other good things.

From all this, then, which has hitherto been said and proved from God's Word with thorough truth, let our opponents one day open their eyes and see how the Mass has been introduced not only without God's Word, but also contrary to it, and be ashamed to doubt it any longer. For it is not enough, let them only point out to their people that the church has always accepted its Mass and received it from the apostles, which they only say with mere words to make a blue haze before the eyes of the simple, but do not prove in eternity, which they are hereby commanded to defy, that they should prove from the Scriptures and the first Fathers in the first church, that the Lord's Supper is actually a sacrifice, indeed a propitiatory sacrifice, and not for the living alone, but also for the dead, and that Christ Jesus in the Lord's Supper slaughtered himself in an unbloody manner, sacrificed himself, and that consequently in the Mass he is thus to be slaughtered and sacrificed in an unbloody manner, *incruento modo*, by the ministers of the Mass

which the papists preach in their Mass. If this is proved by them from the Scriptures or from the holy Fathers of the early Church, let us accept the Mass and fall in with them.

But this is so certain, as true as God's Word is true, that the papal altar priests can never prove and enforce it in one place. May God convert those who are to be converted, so that they may open their eyes and be saved from this abomination, which Daniel pointed out in chapter 12. Amen, in the name of Jesus Christ, Amen.

## **The tenth article. [ToC](#)**

# **Of One or Both**

## **kinds in the Holy Sacrament of the Altar.**

What is the main dispute here?

This is the main controversy, whether it is right for the Roman pope to take the chalice away from the laity and pretend that it belongs only to the clergy. We say it is not right and can never be approved. The opponents say it is right.

For what reasons do we not think it is right?

For the following reasons: 1. when we consider the institution of the Lord Jesus Christ, we find that he has not instituted one form, but two forms. What then should move us to depart from this order of Jesus Christ? Should not Christ Jesus be most valid with us, do we not act most safely when we follow his appointment, and our adversaries may not object. Christ did not institute it thus? Because this is so clear and bright that even the Council of Costnitz and the Council of Trent must themselves confess it.

2. Thus Christ Jesus, as the evangelists testify, instituted only one supper, not two, one for the priests, the other for the laity, but as we all have one baptism, so we all have one sacrament of the supper of Jesus Christ. And no pope will be able to show that Christ ordained a special supper for the clergy and a special one for the secular, but for both of them one and the same, namely his true body and his true blood. This is irrefutably true.

3. For more confirmation, Christ especially said of the cup, Matt. 26 [:27]: Drink ye all from it, which they also did, and they all drank from it, Mark 14 [:23], which was said at that time to the apostles alone, but under their name to the whole Christian church, just as Christ says of the body: Eat, which Christ also said at that time to the apostles present alone. Nevertheless, there were also other Christians and laymen among their number, which our adversaries themselves must confess. If it is possible for them, they may show that Christ gave the body to the church under the apostles' names, but not the cup. But how do they want to demonstrate this, how is it possible?

4. For these reasons the holy apostle Paul with special diligence put in the other part ὡσάντως, *Similiter*, of the **same** opinion, even the same has Jesus given the cup to whom he gave the blessed bread. This is to indicate that Christ did nothing special with the cup, or gave it to them, the apostles, on the condition that it should remain with the spiritual order alone, but should be distributed to believing Christians in the same way as the blessed bread.

5. Therefore, when the apostle St. Paul instructs the Corinthians how they should show themselves in the use of this sacrament, he does not say: The laity should receive only the body, but the priests also the blood, but he says in general: **Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of this bread and drink of this cup, etc. The man**, says St. Paul. The priests will not be the only people.

So further he says [1 Corinthians 11:26]: **As often as you (Corinthians) eat of this bread and drink of this cup, you shall proclaim the death of the Lord.**



He says this to Christians in general, not to priests alone. What does he say? He says not only that they eat of the bread, but also that they drink of the cup. This proves sufficiently that the Corinthians were not deprived of the cup in the days of St. Paul.

6. The Christian churches have only just followed this praiseworthy practice of the church at Corinth, because such use of Holy Communion is entirely consistent with the institution of the Lord Jesus Christ. Although there are some among our opponents today who are not afraid or ashamed to write publicly that the one form has been among Christians for about 1600 years, they do so without any reason, except that they deceive the simple-minded, for many of the popes themselves have confessed and written publicly that in the first Christian church Christians always communicated in both forms. Hence the *Fathers* in the *Concilio* at Costnitz say freely and publicly: *Licet in primitiva Ecclesia hujusmodi Sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus, sub utraque specie: Hoc tamen non obstante, &c.* That is, whether already in the first Christian church the sacrament was taken by the faithful in two forms, but this without hindrance, etc.

At the time of the most laudable emperors Maximilian and Ferdinand, there was a very learned papal theologian by the name of *Georgius Cassander*, whom the aforementioned Roman emperors both held very dear and esteemed, also asked him for advice, as he did from others, thus also about this article and graciously requested that he, *Cassander*, would record and send his opinion to Their Imperial Majesties. This he did, *Cassander*, and writes about this article, among others, in his advice:

Satis compertum est, Universalem Christi Ecclesiam, in hunc usque diem, Occidentalem vero, seu Romanam, mille amplius a Christo annis, in solenni praesertim, & ordinariae huius Sacramenti dispensatione, utramque panis & vini speciem, omnibus Ecclesiae Christi membris exhibuisse, ad quod ex innumeris veterum Scriptorum, tam Graecorum, quam Latinorum testimoniis manifestum est manifestum. Atque ut ita facerent, inductos fuisse primum instituto, exemploque Christi, qui hoc

Sacramentum corporis & sanguinis sui, duobus hisce panis & vini Symbolis, discipulis suis, fidelium personam repraesentantibus, praebuilt.

That is to say in German [**in English**]:

It is sufficiently known and evident that the universal Church of Christ **to this day**, but the Western or Roman Church more than a thousand years after Christ, especially in the public and orderly dispensation of this sacrament, both the bread and the wine, was given to all the members of the Church of Christ, which is evident from **innumerable** testimonies of the ancient writers, both Latin and Greek. And that they did so, they were moved, first of all, by the example and institution of Christ, who gave and distributed this sacrament of his body and blood, under these two species of bread and wine, to his disciples, who at that time represented the faithful communicants.

Behold, Christians, this noble papal teacher confesses, and writes to the Roman emperors, that the universal Christian Church, from the time of Christ until his day, has always administered the sacrament in both forms. What then may some write to the contrary, that the one act has always been, and it is well to note that the aforementioned *Cassander* adds something further to this:

Quare non temere est, quod optimi quique & Catholicae professionis, in divinorum, & Ecclesiasticorum lectione versati, & his, quas supra diximus, rationibus incitati, summo desiderio potiundi calicis Dominici incenduntur, omnibusque modis contendunt, ut hoc salutare Sacramentum sanguinis Christi, una cum Sacramento corporis, juxta veterem consuetudinem, & multis seculis perpetuatam, Universalis Ecclesiae consuetudinem in usum reducatur.

That is:

Therefore it is not out of frivolity that pious Catholics, well versed in the books of God and the Church, for these and other reasons, have such a great desire for the chalice and endeavor in all kinds of ways that this salutary sacrament of the blood of Jesus Christ, together with the sacrament of the body, may again be used and dispensed according to the ancient use and custom of many hundreds of years of the common churches.

Well then, it has been customary for many hundreds of years to administer the sacrament in two different forms, as this distinguished papal teacher testifies. How dare they now say, contrary to their conscience, that the one form has always been customary and usual? Why do they cry out that we speak against the universal Christian Church, when their own teacher says that those who give only one form do so against the Church, and says: He can prove from innumerable testimonies of the ancient teachers that both parts of the sacrament have always been distributed to all members of the Church of Christ. What will they answer to this?

That is probably the honest truth. But they have a lot of objections and excuses to whitewash their doctrine.

They are nothing but pretenses, for nothing can really be brought forward against the thorough truth. But I am prepared to answer if you briefly recount their objections one by one.

First, they say that they confess that one may receive the sacrament under both forms, but also under one, because it is free.

Answer: It is not an indifferent thing (adiaphora); Christ did not leave it to us, nor did St. Paul to the Corinthians, that they should use the sacrament as they pleased, but Christ said to the apostles: **Do this**, what I have done, do this and nothing else. He did not say: It is up to you whether you want to keep the chalice for yourselves alone and withdraw it from the laity. The sacred sacraments are not something in between, but things that are based on God's word and are dispensed and distributed according to God's word. The Councils of Costnitz and Trent clearly states that it is not a free matter to commune under one or both forms, but that it is necessary to dispense the sacrament to the laity under one form, so this objection is meaningless.

Because the body of Christ is not without blood, for it is a living body, therefore the laity also receive the blood under the form of the body.

This is their greatest and most noble aid in this whole article, but it is also easily overturned and refuted.

1. If so, why can't the altar priests also be satisfied with one kind?

2. Although the body of Christ is naturally not without blood, yet the Lord Christ has so ordained that he has dispensed his body and his blood under special elements, namely, that one should eat his body under the bread, not drink his blood under the bread, but eat, eat, eat his body and drink his blood under the wine, not eat his body under the wine. Since Christ Jesus himself knew that his body is not without blood, but nevertheless dispenses and distributes his body and blood in different ways, let us stick to this and not prescribe anything to Christ.

3. Thus it is also undeniable, even if the body is not the blood, that body and blood are nevertheless distinct. The body is a different essence, the blood is a different essence. So what is distinct, Christ Jesus can also give in different ways.

4. Nor do we find these doctrines in Scripture, but the antithesis. For St. Paul says in 1 Corinthians 10 [:16-17] that the blessed bread is a communion of the body of Jesus Christ. He does not say that the bread is a communion of the blood, or of the body and blood together, but that the bread is a communion of the body and the cup a communion of the blood. It is this: Christ wants to give us his body with the bread and his blood with the wine. We must look to this will and order of Jesus Christ and not master it. The question is not whether Christ could have given us his body and blood in the bread at the same time, but whether he wanted to give it in this way. We do not find this to be the case, but he wanted to give us his body with the bread and his blood with the wine.

5. If we also received Christ's blood with the bread, we would not only have to say: Take, eat, but at the same time: Take, eat and drink; this blessed bread is the communion of the body and blood of Christ. But who wants to do this without and against God's Word? And how is it fitting that one should eat the blood? That one should drink the body of Christ in the other part with the blood?

6. It would also follow that in the whole sacrament the blood of Jesus Christ is received twice, once under the

bread, the other time under the wine. Where is this written, where is it found among the apostles, where was it heard in the ancient Christian universal church?

7. Even if the popes regard their own doctrine, this work does not exist, for they themselves confess that in the consecration the bread is changed into the body and nothing into the blood, which is found now and then in their books.

8. Therefore a papal teacher, *Andreas Fricius*, writes thus against this erroneous opinion and concomitance:

Separarim comestio nominatur, separatim bibitio, ab illa sapientia increata, cui sapientia omnis Humana, de inseparabilitate sanguinis vivi a carne viva cedere debet. Non enim hic disputandum est ex rationibus humanis, sed voluntas Christi intuenda, quae convivium non mancum instituit, sed cibo addidit potum.

That is in German [*in English*]:

It is especially called the eating, especially the drinking of uncreated wisdom, to which all human reason must give way with the inseparability of the living blood from the living flesh. For there is no need to argue on the basis of human reason, but the will of Christ must be considered, who did not prepare half a meal, but also gave drink as food.

This is a reasonable speech from a papist; let our opponents follow it and abandon their complacency. Whoever desires further refutation of this error, may read blessed Luther, printed in the third part of his German books at Jena, on the 528th leaf, etc., without hesitation. I hope, however, that from the pieces which I have now related, one will have sufficient reason to beware of this error.

St. Paul says: Whoever eats of this bread unworthily, or drinks of this cup unworthily. Because he says “or”, he leaves it up to you to communicate under one or both forms.

This is a futile expedient, because:

1. Thus all papists, by virtue of the Council of Trent in the 4th Session, *Decret.* 2, to accept the old Latin version and not to depart from it at all.
- 2.

Now it does not say *Aut*, “or”, but *Et*, “and”: Whoever of this bread **and of** this cup, etc.

2. Although in the Greek there is a little word which means as much as **or**, yet it is not of the kind that it separates from one another, but *distinguishes*, distinguishes, as here in Paul, who distinguishes the loaf and the cup, because they are also distinct in themselves; for the loaf is not the cup, the cup is not the loaf.

3. It would follow that one could also communicate under the cup alone, which our adversaries themselves do not want to allow.

4. This is contrary to the conciliar councils of Costnitz and Trent, which do not, in fact, allow communing under one or both forms, but in fact deprive the laity of the chalice and forbid it, even saying that the one form is to be regarded as a law.

5. Finally, these words must not be interpreted contrary to the institution, but according to the institution of Christ. The institution, however, does not leave it up to us whether we want to drink the cup, but orders and commands us all to drink from it. And the evangelists write: *Similiter*, in the same way, Christ also gave the cup to drink from it, just as he gave the blessed bread to eat, that is, not freely.

The Council of Costnitz also has this reason, among others, why the laity were denied the chalice because of the danger that the blood might remain in the beards of the laity.

The cardinals, bishops, prelates and the whole Council of Costnitz have set this cause. Is it to be wondered at and lamented that in such important matters one acts so dissolutely? Well, let us answer this properly:

1. This is the blood of Jesus Christ, which is drunk after the institution of Jesus Christ, not that which remains in the beard, for the same, because it is out of ordinary use, is not blood but wine.

2. But if it were so (as it never is), would it not be better for the laity to have their beards cut off and give sixpence to the barber, than that they should be deprived of the most holy blood of Jesus Christ?

3. And why did he, Christ, give the apostles, who had large beards, as especially [Nicephorus](#)

writes of St. Peter, that he had *barbam crispam & densam*, a curly and thick beard? Why did he not send them to the barber first?

4. How then did St. Paul himself allow the Corinthians to drink the cup, since there is no doubt that many of them had beards?

5. But how do the poor women come to be deprived of the cup, since the cause is not valid? Therefore this *ratio* and *motio* is quite vain, quite ridiculous, stemming from the transformation.

They also say: If the blood is kept for a long time, it may turn into vinegar or even spoil, so that worms and similar vermin grow out of it.

With this cause, one can see with what atrocious blasphemy the error of the one form must be glossed over. Why is it necessary to keep the wine so long, can we not have fresh wine at all times? 2. Now if the wine were to turn sour, the blood of Jesus Christ would not turn sour, the blood of Jesus Christ would not spoil, and vermin would not grow from the blood of Jesus Christ. Would it be a miracle if the earth were to split open and avenge such blasphemy? David says of the person of Christ in the 16th Psalm [:10]: You will not allow your Holy One to rot. Of course, the blood of Jesus Christ cannot decay. That is why St. Peter in the first epistle, chapter 1 [:19], calls it a *sanguinem preciosum*, a precious blood, which, like silver and gold, is not perishable. Indeed, if the wine were transformed into the blood of Christ according to the papal opinion, and if blood were also beyond consumption, then they would be able to enjoy it. Even if it were so, the blood of Jesus Christ could not corrupt, any more than Christ Jesus himself can corrupt. The dear, faithful God graciously protects every Christian heart from having such thoughts about the precious, imperishable blood of his Savior Jesus Christ.

If the laity received the chalice just as well as the clergy, they could remember that the laity are just as important as the clergy.

So, I hear, it is only a matter of preference, of the tiresome pride. Should the holy sacrament help to strengthen the arrogance of the clergy? In

God's eyes, all Christians are one; no one is worth more than the other. That is why the clergy and the regular people [*Weltliche*] have one God, one baptism, one faith, one Word, one forgiveness of sins, one heaven, one eternal blessedness of soul. Our Lord God does not do anything special to anyone in this case. So all Christians, spiritual and regular, also have the sacrament of Holy Communion. And because Christ Jesus granted the laity the cup just as well as the clergy, what do we want to take away from them? Is it because Christ is so gracious that our eyes are dim? The laity need forgiveness of sins just as much as the clergy, which is why Christ gave them his blood for the forgiveness of their sins. St. Peter did not despise the laity, but held them in high esteem, calling them all a royal priesthood and a chosen people, in the first epistle of Peter in the second chapter [1 Peter 2:9-12]. For this reason, the *patres* at Costnitz might well have stayed at home with this argument, so that they themselves would not have proclaimed their proud name like the cuckoo.

Furthermore, they say: For this reason we must now hold so firmly to the one form that we do not think that the Roman Church is mistaken and that those who have introduced the one form are damned.

That is the whole deal. But even if they hold to it a thousand times as firmly, every pious Christian will know that the Roman Church has erred and is still erring. Will this cause be upheld one day at death's door, when conscience awakens, or on the Last Day before the judgment seat of Jesus Christ, when He will demand an account? We believe that Christ Jesus will not allow himself to be rebuffed, but will punish them most severely for having abandoned his commandment for the sake of the Roman Church, for having acted contrary to His Word and not obeyed it. Woe then to the ringleaders, how will they stand? The simple-minded and the laity, who were forced to do so by force or deceived by the clergy, if they otherwise kept the foundation of their faith, Christ Jesus, in their hearts, had to console themselves and still pray to the intercession of Jesus Christ: Father, forgive them, they know not what they do. But those who have practiced this tyranny and introduced cup snatching will remember the words of the 56th Psalm: God, you will cast them down into the deep pits, etc. [Ps 55:23]



Veit *Miletus*, a papist, writes in a book: If the apostles had not taken both forms, St. Peter would not have denied Christ and the apostles would not have abandoned Christ, would not have fled.

This is truly blindness upon blindness, blasphemy upon blasphemy. Thus the holy blood of Jesus Christ caused St. Peter to deny Christ and the apostles to flee from him. O thou most holy blood of Jesus Christ, wherewith shalt thou have caused or wrought this? Where is there a single letter in the Scriptures, indeed, where is there a single word, a **single word**, a single word, I say, in all the books of the ancient Fathers? We may well say here: It is hard to tempt against the sting.

Just one more thing: there are quite a few Miletus who cannot drink wine at all, so the cup has been abolished for their sake.

Yes, who would or could believe it, there are many such people, but few, how would the others get to the point that they would have to repay them? 2. The reason does not apply to the papists in particular. They have no wine in their sacrament, but only blood. Thus the deprived (*abstemii*), who do not drink wine, may not express themselves or shy away from the chalice, because according to the papal *transubstantiation* they do not drink wine, but only blood. Therefore this objection is absolutely useless. 3. But even if wine is taken and partaken of in this sacrament, an abstaining (*abstemious*) person, one who does not drink wine, can still take one, two or three drops in honor of his Lord Jesus Christ and for the salvation of his soul by the grace of God, without his embarrassment, if he prays diligently and calls upon God. I can confirm this with my own example, as I also have a natural aversion to wine and have never drunk any other wine in my life. Nevertheless, God the Holy Spirit (to whom be praise and thanksgiving) has always given me the grace, after previous devout prayer, that I have been able to use the blessed cup in the Most Holy Communion, and God will do the same to others who call upon him for it. 4. Could it not happen that one or more of the clergy by nature do not drink wine? From this it would be necessary to deprive all clergy of the cup? It would then be a matter of admitting no one into

their order, for he could then honestly raise the large glasses. 5. Finally, and in conclusion, if these or other causes were sufficient, Christ Jesus, the supreme wisdom, would have known it. But alas, we have come to the time when wisdom must be vindicated by her children. We ask God to keep us in the truth. His Word is the truth. Amen.

### The eleventh article. [ToC](#)

# On Sacrificing and Praying for the Dead

What is the main dispute here?

**T**he main dispute here is whether one should pray for the dead, make sacrifices, say Mass and the like. The Popes say yes, we say no.

For what reasons?

1. It is evident that in all holy, divine, prophetic, and apostolic Scripture there is not one word, or even one letter, which commands us to do this, which the Holy Spirit would not have omitted if he had known that it was so necessary. Therefore, if we do not want to suspect the Holy Spirit of not letting us record this in the Scriptures, either out of envy or through oversight, we must certainly believe that there is not much to be said for prayer and sacrifice for the dead.

2. So praying like this cannot help the dead, for if they are souls of the righteous, they are in God's hands, as Revelation also says in chapter 14 [:13]: Blessed are those who sleep in the Lord **from now on**. But if they are ungodly souls, they go with the rich glutton into the abyss of hell, and there all baptism,

all chrism and prayer is lost, as the German proverb says, and the popes themselves confess that no one can be saved from hell.

3. Indeed, Scripture clearly confesses that no one can save another or redeem his soul, as it says in the 49th Psalm [: ]: **"A brother can save no one, nor God reconcile anyone, for it costs too much to redeem their soul, that he must leave it forever.** From this it is clear that a deceased person is no longer helped by praying, saying Mass, saying vigils, etc. Hence St. Augustine writes, de temp. serm. 219: Frustra parentibus ac propinquis curam tuam injungis: Nemo te post mortem tuam fideliter redimet: quia in vita tute redimere noluisti.

That is:

It is in vain that you enjoin your care on your parents and friends. After your death **no one** will faithfully save you, because in your life you did not want to save yourself.

4. Much less can we approve of papal supplications and sacrifices in which such abominable abuses are practiced as turning the holy sacrament of the altar into a sacrifice of the Mass, invoking not only God but also the departed saints, submitting the soul to God by such works, and thus turning the most sacred merit of Jesus Christ into water. That the dream of purgatory and other such ungodly doctrines and works should be incorporated, which we cannot approve of in the papal prayer and sacrifice for the departed, because they go straight against God and His holy commandment, and we are only surprised that our opponents still quarrel or condemn us in this case, because we refuse to consent to their doctrine, not without cause, but out of highly important motives.

Nevertheless, it is undeniable that one reads from the ancients how they prayed over the deceased, because the fathers did so in the ancient church, so it is reasonable that we do the same.

We do not deny that the Fathers Tertullian, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Clemente, Augustine, Ambrose, Cyrill, Ephrem, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Athanasius, Basilio, etc., commemorated the prayer for the departed in many ways. The prayers for the departed are often commemorated, and our counterparts should not be so overburdened with their

testimonies from the books of the Fathers, with which they unnecessarily spend many pages, for we know it, we confess it and thus respond:

1. In order to prove that a doctrine is right, not only the antiquity, the testimony of the ancient fathers, is necessary, but first of all the Word of the Most High, as David says in the 119th Psalm [:105]: **Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet.**

2. Now it is certain that the sacred canonical Scriptures do not report this at all. And the most ancient fathers, not Moses, not David, not Solomon, not Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, not Zacharia, not Malachi, nor Christ or his holy apostles, not Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, James, these are the true ancient fathers, whose testimony is immediately valid and accepted as the Word of God. Let the adversaries deal with us from this antiquity and, if they can, prove their doctrine by the steps of the prophets and apostles.

3. Nevertheless, a Christian should pay attention to the fact that, although the Fathers remembered prayers for the dead, there was a much, much different opportunity to do so than there is in the papacy. For they had not held a propitiatory sacrifice for the departed souls, they did not want to help the souls through the merits of men, as happens in the papacy, but their prayers for the departed and the prayers over the departed were celebrated and held:

1. That the deceased have been praised, their works and virtues commended, as is still customary in funeral sermons. 2. That they hereby declare their faithful mind, they have wished the deceased all salvation, welfare and blessedness of soul. 3. It was generally done for the consolation of the sorrowful, if they still had any left in life, that they might be reminded of the blessed state into which the soul of the deceased had come. Hence Epiphanius *Haeres.* 75, which was the cause that such prayers were held: *Nempe, quod crederent, eos, qui decesserant, vivere apud Deum, & quod ita restarentur spem suam, utpote, qui adhuc in peregrinatione essent.*

That is:

Therefore they prayed, because they believed that those who had died were now living with God, and that they might testify to their

hope, who were still wandering, that they also might hope for eternal life.

To this end, then, they have held such *preces*, not to redeem or save souls from their torment, as is customary in the papacy, hence St. Chrysostom writes Homil. 70. ad pop. Antiochenum: Quid sibi volunt hymni? Nonne glorificamus Deum, & illi gratias agimus, quia jam defunctum coronavit, & alaboribus absolutum, penes se retinet?

That is:

What do the prayers and hymns mean, do we not praise God and thank him that He has now crowned the deceased, redeemed him from all labor and kept him with himself?

The most distinguished Fathers have referred to this in most of their testimonies. But what equality is there between prayer and the papal prayer for the dead? Just as there is equality between a living man and his likeness, of which no one can say that it is the living man himself. Consider how St. Augustine prayed for his mother (*Confess. 1. 9, c. 12*). As St. Ambrose prayed for the Emperor Theodosium, so you will not find such papal manifold stubble.

4. If the popes thus flaunt antiquity and the ancient Fathers, and desire that one should do all that they did, that was held and was customary with them, why do they not do other things more, which are to be found both with the Fathers and were customary with them, as: in the liturgies of St. Chrysostom it is to be seen that the ancients also prayed for the Virgin Mary, for the holy prophets and apostles, for the holy martyrs. The popes do not do this, the ancients prayed for the wicked, who had died, the popes pray only for the pious, the ancients celebrated their birthdays publicly, holding their prayers and other ceremonies, the popes do not do this, and countless other things. What is the reason that they do not follow the ancients in this? They must confess that they are not bound by all that the Fathers did, are they not bound? Who wants to bind us to the fathers? Are we directed to them by God? No, but they with us to Christ, to the Scriptures, to the Word of God. Therefore we can ill

say, when they come up so incessantly with their antiquities, with their fathers, what is written there in 1 Samuel 2: **Let your great boasting and rebellion cease, let the old things be in your mouths, for the Lord is a God who notices such things and does not allow such pretensions to succeed.** And in the 20th chapter of the prophet Ezekiel [:18-19], God speaks thus: **You shall not live by the commandments of your fathers, nor keep their statutes.** Again: **You shall live by my commandments, and you shall keep my statutes and do them.**

In the days of the Lord Jesus Christ, the ancients were also dressed in this way, but Christ Jesus did not want to turn to them because they were not the true ancients, the prophets, as we read in Matthew 5, where Christ says [:21-22],: **You have heard that it was said to the ancients, etc. But I say unto you.** Let it hereby be understood that the ancients said and spoke much without and contrary to God's Word and understanding, especially as it is written in the 43rd verse, that one should hate one's enemies, which was an old but quite false tradition and teaching.

A pious, Christian heart will be content with these narrated pieces and will not allow the name of the old church to be betrayed, especially because it was not ever customary in the apostolic church and all kinds of stubble have subsequently grown in the churches through carelessness, to which we are not bound that we should also sow them or allow them to grow in our churches.

Its highest foundation is from the second book of the [Maccabees in the 12th chapter in the 43rd and 46th verses](#), where the sacrifice and prayer for the deceased is explicitly mentioned.

This foundation does not deepen anything:

1. For it is taken from a book which is not canonical, not inspired by the Holy Spirit, as St. Cyprianus *in exposit. Symp.*, St. Jerome *in lib. Sapient.* and St. Augustine *contra Gaudent lib. 2. c. 23* testify.

2. There are all kinds of other errors in this book, from which it appears that it was not inspired by God. The second book of the Maccabees speaks of the death of Antioch in the 1st chapter quite differently from the first book in the 6th chapter, and it is false that this book reports that the Jews were led in perfidy,

it is false that *Razias* did right by killing himself. In particular, that this book was not inspired by the Holy Spirit is obvious from the conclusion of this book, which reads: If I had done it sweetly, I would have liked to, but if it is too little, I have done as much as I could. The Holy Spirit does not need such an excuse in the canonical books, much less does he say that he might be too little and that he could not have done more, which also moved some popes, so that they did not consider this book to be canonical. As Pope *Gelasium*, who with 70 other bishops only accepted the first book of the Maccabees and not the second. Since this book is not at all strong to discuss a controversy, as St. Augustine himself writes, it cannot count for anything in this respect either, but is suspect precisely because, among other things, it contains the error of the sacrifice for the dead and praises it. Beyond this, if one examines the text and the history itself, it will be found that the papists cannot get away with it. It is beyond all doubt that in the times of the Maccabees many and great errors in religious matters were introduced and all kinds of superstitions came to them from the Gentiles, which the *Historia* [Acts of the Apostles] shows, and it is not an infernal, pagan lie, as the one says, that this sacrifice and prayer of the popes, even Jude the Maccabee, arose from paganism. After all, it is not from God's Word, for Moses recorded in Leviticus all kinds of sacrifices that had to be offered, but there is no mention of an atoning sacrifice for the deceased, not even a single word or letter. Nevertheless, all Jews were pointed to the commandment of God in the 4th and 12th chapters of the 5th book: What I command you, you shall observe to do according to it; you shall not add to it, nor subtract from it. Judas, therefore, made such sacrifices without God's command and against his command, and therefore he sinned and did wrong. Furthermore, the popes themselves say that sacrifices should only be made for the pious, so that they may be saved from purgatory. Now those for whom Judas sacrificed and prayed were not pious, but had committed a real mortal sin. Thus purgatory, as many papists say, was not yet in the Old Testament, which is why this example of Jude proves nothing at all powerful. Otherwise, if it had been God's command

that one should sacrifice and pray for the dead, even for the wicked, the holy patriarchs would not have omitted to do so, David would also have sacrificed and prayed for Saul, for Absalom, since we find nothing of the kind anywhere in all the histories of the Old Testament, regardless of the fact that all kinds of ceremonies and customs held for the deceased were distinguished, not even in the New Testament, since we also have histories of the burials of the dead, there is nothing about sacrificing or praying for them.

Finally, to sum up and conclude, even if such sacrifices and other ceremonies had been commanded in the Old Testament (which they are not), it does not follow that we are bound to them in the New Testament, because the ceremonial law has been abolished by Christ Jesus. Otherwise, O faithful God, how much more would we have to perform sacrifices and other things that we were obliged to do in the Old Testament by virtue of God's commandment, which all Christian hearts know and understand for themselves, if only they read in the third, fourth and fifth books of Moses [[Leviticus](#), [Numbers](#), [Deuteronomy](#)] and consider how such commandments no longer apply in the New Testament. Now that the argument in favor is sufficiently refuted, we hope that everyone will manfully note that there is no reason for sacrifices and pontifical prayers for the deceased, and that we cannot and should not consent to this article for highly important reasons. May the Holy Spirit prick the blind and deceived and enlighten them through His Holy Word for the sake of Jesus Christ. Amen.

## The twelfth article. [ToC](#) Of Purgatory.

What is the Pope's doctrine of purgatory?

**S**o that they may not be wronged, I will faithfully and sincerely record their opinion from their champion, [Robert Bellarmine](#), who is now their most distinguished scribe, and set down here what they think of purgatory.



First, he says, the papists call purgatory a place in which, as in a dungeon, after this life the souls are purged which have not been so perfectly purified in the temporal life that they might have gone to heaven, *Bell. lib. 1. de purgat. c. 1.*

Secondly, the scholastics held that this place under the earth was divided into four parts: in the one were the damned, in the other those who were still to be baptized, in the third the children who died without baptism, in the fourth those who died before Christ's Passion. *Bellarm. lib. 2. de purgat. c. 6.*

Thirdly, they believe that the fire with which the souls are tormented is a very real fire and the very fire that burns in hell. Thus the souls are tormented with infernal fire in the furnace of hell, and are martyred and burned in the most horrible manner. *Bellarm. lib. 2. de purgat. c. 10. & 11. & 14.*

But it is still uncertain whether the souls are thus tormented by devils or by angels, or by fire alone, nor is it actually known how long such torment lasts. *Bellarm. lib. 2. de purgat, c. 9. & 13.*

In this agony, however, the souls are helped a great deal by the Church's intercessions, by Masses for the soul, by indulgences and indulgences. *Lib. 2. de purgat. c. 1.5. & 16.*

Therefore, let such souls be sure that they will finally go to heaven and be eternally saved. *Libro eodem, Cap. 4.*

Their doctrine of purgatory consists in these parts. What do you think now, dear Christian, is it unjust, is it wrong that we Evangelicals do not accept such a poem, reject it and do not allow it to pass for an article of faith? Have we not reason enough?

What causes?

We have not one, but several, not minor, but highly important causes:

1. Because no word of this purgatory is found in all sacred Scripture, which of the Old Testament many popes themselves have confessed.

2. Because it was introduced not only without Scripture, but also contrary to Scripture and the Word of God, which will now be sufficiently demonstrated.

3. For the Scriptures, when they often speak of the state of souls, do not refer to more than two states: heaven and hell, eternal salvation and eternal damnation Mark 16 [:16]: **He who believes and is baptized will be saved, but he who does not believe will be damned.** There is no thought of a purgatory, no middle place.

4. Which the parable, Luke 16, of the rich man and the poor Lazarus likewise confirms, since there are only two states to be found, salvation and damnation.

5. St. Paul, in the first epistle to the Thessalonians in chapter 4 [:13 ff.], says that he does not want the state of the dead to be unknown. For this reason he explains this doctrine to them, but no mention is made of purgatory.

6. It is evident from papal writing that only the pious souls who fall asleep in the Lord go to purgatory, and not immediately to heaven or into the hand of God. But now it is certain that this is contrary to Scripture, for it says that those who believe and die in faith will not be tormented but will have eternal life. And this immediately after their death, so that the soul is not martyred with hellish torment in purgatory.

In the 3rd chapter of the Book of Wisdom [:1]: **The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God and no torment touches them.** John 3 [:18]: **He who believes in the Son will not be judged, but he who does not believe has already been judged.** John 5 [:24]: **Truly, truly, I say to you, he who keeps my word and believes him who sent me has eternal life and will not come into judgment, but has passed from death to life.** In the 14th chapter of the Revelation of John [:13]: **Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from now on.**

7. Take the example of the thief who, in the opinion of the popes, still had many sins to be punished, and would have been worthy of several years in purgatory. But Christ the Lord says to him, Luke 23 [:43]: **Today you will be with me in paradise.** It does not say that if you will be saved from purgatory for 3, 6, 10,

20, 30, etc. years. year, I will take you into paradise, but **today, today**, when your soul departs from the body, it shall be with me in paradise.

8. Where is it also possible that they will only be saved in purgatory? The dead can no longer earn anything. **The dead will not praise the Lord.** In the 115th Psalm [:17]. Nor can other people's merit, other people's work, come to their aid, as Christ indicates in Matthew 25 [:8-9]: When the foolish virgins wanted to borrow oil from the wise, it was not for them; the door was shut behind them. Nor can they turn back after death, but as they should, so they lie, as it says in the 11th chapter of Ecclesiastes [:3-4]: **When the tree falls, let it fall at noon or midnight, on whichever place it falls, there it will lie.**

9. It is also not time after death to purify ourselves of all sins and to prepare ourselves properly for salvation in purgatory. God has given us enough time in this life; he who does not repent there is lost; there will be no more repentance, no more penitence, no more supplication. This is why St. Paul says in the epistle to the Galatians in chapter 6 [:10]: **Since we now have time, let us do good.** And in the second epistle to the Corinthians in chapter 6 [:2]: **Behold, now is the acceptable time, now is the day of salvation.** Now, says Paul, not in purgatory after death, for which reason the Holy Spirit so highly exhorts us in the 95th Psalm [:7-8]: **Today, if you hear his voice, do not hide your heart.** He who does not repent here, who is not reconciled to God here, will certainly be too late there in purgatory. Let it not be said, as it is written in the first chapter of Proverbs [:24], **Because I call and you refuse, I stretch out my hand and no one heeds it, and you forsake all my counsel and do not want my punishment. So I will laugh at you in your mischief, and mock you when that which you fear comes.**

Again [:28]: **Then they will call me, but I will not answer; they will seek me early and not find me.**

10. The doctrine of purgatory also contradicts the merit of Jesus Christ. For if hellish purgatory must cleanse the faithful from their sins, it follows

irrefutably that Christ's suffering and death do not cleanse us from all our sins, which, as shown above in the article on justification, is stated so many times in Scripture that we **have been healed by his wounds**. Isaiah 53 [:3]: **And that Christ is the propitiation for our sins and the sins of the whole world**. In the first epistle of John 2 [:2]: **Nor is there any other name given whereby one may be saved than the name of Jesus**. So purgatory must fall, and must be false, that purgatory may cleanse us from our sins, that masses, vigils, indulgences, and the like may help us to heaven, as the popes clearly declare; for Christ is the only Mediator; it is he alone who saves us. 1 Timothy 2, Isaiah 45, Isaiah 63.

11. Argues against the article of faith in the forgiveness of sins. Christ says: What is **loosed here on earth shall be loosed in heaven** [Matt. 18:18-20]. Nowhere does it say that what we shall loose in purgatory by keeping Mass, by vigils, by pilgrimages, by money, by indulgences, shall be loosed in heaven.

12. If purgatory is contrary to the nature and kind of our faith, St. Paul says in Romans 5 [:1]: **Now that we have been justified by faith, we have peace**. But in purgatory we have no peace, because there we are to be burned with hellish flames. And who would long to come out of this life in this way, if we were to endure hellish torment, even if we had fallen asleep in the Lord? St. Paul who says [Phil. 1:23]: **I desire to depart and to be with Christ**. *Bellarminus* and the popes desire only that they may enter purgatory and be tormented there either by devils, or by angels, or by infernal fire. May God protect us from that lust for which no God-fearing man ever longed, neither in the Old nor in the New Testament. St. Paul, as we have heard, comforts himself, and his soul longs for Christ. David longs for the living God in the 42nd Psalm [:1-2]: As a deer cries out for fresh water, so my soul cries out to God. My soul thirsts for God, for the living God. When shall I come to see the face of God? This is the nature of our faith, not that we should wish for such hellish torment or be afraid of it.

13. That souls are only certain of their salvation in purgatory is also contrary to God. Job was still alive and says in chapter 19 [:25]: He knew that his Redeemer would raise him up and give him salvation. St. Paul was still alive when he said to the Romans in chapter 8 [:38]: **I am sure of this, that neither death nor life, nor angels nor principalities, etc., can separate me from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus.** St. John was still alive and wrote to the living in the third chapter of the first epistle of John [:2]: **We are now children of God, and it has not yet appeared what we shall be. But we know that when it appears we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.** Behold, they all knew this before they died, before they went into purgatory, for none of them went into purgatory. Christ says [Mark 16:16]: **He who believes and is baptized is sure of salvation.** It does not say: And he who enters purgatory. For these and other highly important reasons, we can with a clear conscience accept purgatory as no article of faith, because purgatory is contrary to God's Word, without God's Word and contrary to our articles of faith, which a pious heart can easily see for the reasons given.

Many pious people die a Christian death, but have not yet been forgiven of all their sins; they now go to purgatory.

Whoever dies in Christ Jesus in a truly Christian and blessed manner has forgiveness of all sins; for through faith in Christ Jesus all sins are covered and completely forgiven, both great sins and others. Nor does the Scripture say that forgiveness of sins is to be expected in purgatory after this life, but we sing in our Christian faith: **Here all sins are forgiven.** And St. Peter says in the 10th chapter of the Apostolic Histories [Acts 10:43]: **All the prophets testify of Jesus that in his name all who believe in him receive forgiveness of sins.** Since the souls in purgatory do not believe in God, do not believe in Christ Jesus, and since faith extends only to this time of life, not to this world, it is clear that the souls in purgatory cannot obtain forgiveness of sins after this life, much less will they acquire salvation from sins through their sufferings or works,

because no man can reconcile God with all his own righteousness, or expiate a single sin. It must be done by the precious rose-colored blood of our Lord Jesus Christ alone, who by himself and not by means of purgatory has purchased eternal redemption. Hebrews 9.

Because some are weak in faith, they cannot go to heaven immediately, but must remain in purgatory for a while longer.

Perhaps they will be launched in their faith in purgatory? Through what? They do not hear God's Word there, they have no sacrament, they would only be strengthened in their faith through hellish torture. Such *absurd* and abominable teachings follow from the poem of purgatory. But it is to be known that faith justifies, not by being weak or strong, but by beholding Jesus Christ. So a weak faith cannot be an obstacle to salvation, for it is faith after all. And the weak faith grasps the Jesus Christ that the strong one grasps, just as a weak hand grasps the gold coin that the strong one grasps. **For God does not want to break the bruised reed or extinguish the smoldering wick.** Isaiah 42 [:3] So this argument is as much to purgatory as nothing.

Since nothing common or unclean may enter heaven, Rev. 21 [:27], and souls cannot be purified in this way here on earth, they must be completely polished and purified in purgatory.

We can be cleansed from all sins in this world through the Word, through the holy sacraments, through the blood of Jesus Christ, which the Scriptures clearly testify, Isaiah 1 [:18]: **If your sin is as red as blood, let it become as white as snow; if it is as the color of scarlet, let it become as wool.** 1 John 1 [:7]: **The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin.** This is why St. Paul says of his Corinthians in the first epistle in chapter 6 [:11]: **You have been washed, you have been sanctified, you have been justified by the name of Jesus and by the Spirit of our God.** In how many passages it is to be noted that we are made clean through Christ Jesus, not through purgatory. And lest they seek escape

here in this life, we can be made somewhat pure through Christ, but not entirely undefiled. So let a pious heart give heed to the words of St. Paul to the Ephesians in chapter 5 [:25-27], which read thus: **Christ gave himself for the church, that he might sanctify it, and purify it** (not only in purgatory or after this life) **by the washing of water in the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or stain or any such thing, but that it might be holy and blameless.**

This passage is as clear as day, proving how Christ Jesus cleanses his believers through his blood, Word and Sacrament here in this life so that no stain or wrinkle can be seen or felt on them. It is therefore unnecessary that they should only be cleansed of their stains in purgatory. Jesus Christ's blood will be a thousand times more powerful than all the power of purgatory, which cannot eradicate the slightest sin. **But the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin.** 1 John 1 [:7]. And if Christians here in this world, as the adversaries themselves confess, can be saved from the greatest sins, why not also from the lesser, from the other infirmities, stains and wrinkles? In sum, this doctrine does not exist at all, but is contrary to the revealed Word of God, as has now been proven.

There are several passages on which the popes rely, especially one in the first epistle to the Corinthians in chapter 3 [: ], from which they want to prove purgatory.

The words of the same passage are thus [**1 Cor. 3:11-14**]: No one can lay any other foundation except the one laid by Jesus Christ. But if anyone builds on this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, everyone's work will be revealed. The day will make it clear, for it will be revealed by fire, and the fire will prove what kind of work each one has done. If someone's work that he has built on it remains, he will receive a reward. But if someone's work is burned up, he will suffer the loss, but he himself will be saved, if only through the fire.

Because fire and probation are mentioned here, they immediately want to infer a purgatory. But whoever considers these words correctly will see that they are never to be understood of papal purgatory. For where is it said that it is a hellish fire in which souls are purified and swept away from their sins? Where does it say that sins are expiated in purgatory? Where does it say that this fire sweeps? Where is it said that in the fire the souls are so miserably tormented after this life before they are let into heaven? All this is to be proved by the passage of St. Paul, if it is to be understood of purgatory.

So the holy apostle wants much more with these words, namely he compares the holy Christian church to a building in verse 9 [1 Cor. 3:9]: You are God's building. He calls the preachers builders who build on the foundation, Jesus Christ. But the builders, he says, do not all build the same, some build gold, silver, precious stones, by which he fully understands the pure, right doctrine of the articles of faith. Just as the Holy Spirit often compares pure doctrine and the Word of God to gold and silver, in Proverbs 8 [:19], Psalms 19 [:10] and 119 [:72], etc. Some, although they keep the foundation of the building, Jesus Christ, yet they build on it wood, hay and stubble. That is, they mix in some errors, either out of simplicity, or out of ignorance, or out of carelessness, but such errors that do not run straight against the foundation of faith. Now how each one has built will be revealed; the day will make it clear, for it will be proved by fire. That is, it will be made clear in its own time, when the fire comes upon it. But what is called fire in Scripture? Purgatory alone? Not at all. Scripture knows nothing of papal purgatory, but the Holy Spirit does. **Again:** The word of the Lord. **Again:** The fire of the cross, of affliction, of temptation is found in Scripture and is called fire. As seen in Psalm 12 [:6-7], Malach 3 [:18], Acts 2, Luke 12 [:21?], 1 Peter 1 [:6-9], etc.

So St. Paul wants to say: After every man's work is found in the fire of temptation or in the fiery trial of the Word of God, he should receive it.



If his work remains in the fire and does not burn up, he will have its reward; but if it does not remain but burns up, he will lose it. He loses it, all his effort and work is in vain, he himself recognizes that his erroneous teaching did not stand the test in the examination and in the trial. But because he always retains the foundation, Jesus Christ, he is saved by fire. It is no different than when his stubble and wood are burned up and consumed in the fire.

This is the simple, clear meaning of these words according to Scripture, and from this it appears that St. Paul is greatly wronged, as if he had spoken of papal purgatory. Although some of the Fathers have applied this passage to purgatory, they have brought purgatory into the passage, not drawn from it. And precisely this false interpretation is to be counted among the stubble. The fathers are not condemned if they have interpreted the words differently than is right, for they have retained the foundation, Jesus Christ, and the stubble has been completely consumed and burned up in the fire of temptation.

As to how the words on papal purgatory are useless, one can conclude from this:

1. The apostle speaks only of teachers, for he says of those who build, those who plant, those who water, which does not refer to the hearers but to the teachers. But the popes speak of all Christians.

2. The apostle speaks only of those who will be saved. The popes also interpret the words of those who are condemned.

3. St. Paul speaks of fire figuratively and in the same way. The popes take the word fire literally.

4. St. Paul says that only the wood and stubble of those who build must be tried in the fire. The popes say: The souls themselves must be tormented, not their stubble alone.

5. St. Paul says that everything must be tried by fire. The gold, silver, and precious stones as well as the wood, hay, and stubble. The popes exclude the gold, silver and precious stones, saying: Only the stubble, that is, the remaining stains, wrinkles, *venialia peccata*, lingering sins, must go into the fire.

6. St. Paul says: It will be revealed. But the popes say that their purgatory is under the earth, which cannot be seen, and it does not help that they say that it will be revealed at the Last Day. For the apostle does not speak of the Last Day, but speaks evil of the day. So also purgatory will be no more at the Last Day, as the popes themselves confess. For this reason this passage cannot, nor should it be understood of the papal purgatory, as appears sufficiently from these foundations now narrated.

*Verbum non fallit, multos speciosa fefellit Glossa, Dei verbo nitere,  
tutus eris.*

The Word never deceives,  
Your own gloss often and very much harms.  
Do thou keep God's Word,  
Let all false glosses go.  
By God's clear Word alone,  
Stay safe here, and there.

In Matthew 12 [:31], Christ says: Whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, neither in this world nor in the next. Since Christ distinguishes between this world and the next, we can conclude from his words that other sins are also forgiven in that world, and that there is no other place where sins are forgiven in that world than in purgatory, then purgatory can be clearly proven from this.

If the adversaries would only hold Scripture up to Scripture, they would easily find what the Lord Christ meant by these words, namely, that sin against the Holy Spirit is not forgiven, Luke 12 [:10]. It will never be forgiven in eternity, Mark 3 [:29]. Therefore Luther, of blessed memory, rightly interpreted and explained these *phrases* and manner of speaking from the two evangelists Mark and Luke in his Bible, where he writes that here Matthew says [:31]: Neither in this world nor in that, Mark thus says: He is guilty of an eternal guilt. This would already be the end of the matter, if one were to abandon all useless pondering and not pull Christ's text by the hair as proof of the purgatory. For where is the word purgatory mentioned here? Where does it say penance (*Ausbüßung*)? How incongruous is the whole passage about purgatory? They point out some

circumstances that are directed to purgatory. The words, “**that world**”, cannot be suited to it. For according to their own confession, purgatory will no longer be in that world, but will cease, which is easy to see. Because that world will remain both the blessed and damned world eternally, but not purgatory. The word to be forgiven does not apply to purgatory either, for in it sins are not actually forgiven, but expiated, as the popes say. About this, the Lord Christ speaks here of mortal sins, of damnable sins, which do not belong in purgatory, say the adversaries themselves, but only the *peccata venialia*, the venial sins, so that the papal purgatory cannot be proved in the least from this passage. And let the Christian reader have more respect for St. Mark and St. Luke than for the popes' interpretation, and abandon their useless brooding.

Matthew 5 [:26]: You will not come out until you have paid the last penny. But it can be paid neither in heaven nor in hell, therefore it must be done in purgatory.

Answer: Whatever can help must help. He who has a torn cloak and cannot have it mended with good cloth seeks all kinds of help. So the popes cannot stand with their purgatory, but they seek what they can find to fortify their purgatory. What does the Lord Christ say about purgatory? He says that we should come to terms peaceably with our adversary so that we do not fall into greater misfortune with the authorities. This is to be understood of the worldly judgment, as the letter reads. Where is there any mention of a fire? But if you want to make an *allegory* and a spiritual interpretation, you cannot base an article on them. “Symbolic Theology is not Argumentative”. *Symbolica Theologia, non est Argumentativa*. For many interpretations can be devised, as the ancient fathers interpreted these words differently, and as the popes wanted to accommodate the words to purgatory soon: Be compliant to your adversary soon. Are souls still to become one with the devil in purgatory? Should they make friends with him? Furthermore, do the souls in purgatory also offer their gifts on the altar? Can they also come to their enemies, whom they had in this world, and be reconciled with

them? No sensible person will say that. Where is the purgatory that they have so firmly founded on these words? They must not only refer one word to purgatory, but the preceding and following must be equally consistent.

All kinds of ghosts have been seen and heard that there is a purgatory, from which one could easily conclude that there is a purgatory.

Of course, this apparition has mostly confirmed and promoted purgatory, as can be seen from the writings of [Pope Gregory the First](#) of that name in his treatise which he calls *Dialogos*, in the 40th chapter of the 4th book, where he speaks of *Paschasio*, and in the 51st chapter, where he talks about the half-burnt nun. Just as in the 55th chapter of the reported book he wants to prove with such fables, fairy tales and apparitions of the departed souls that one can help the souls out of purgatory with the sacrifice of Holy Communion. But we are not directed to apparitions, they cannot make articles of faith, they cannot assure the conscience either here or there. And it is very hard commanded by God that one should not inquire the truth from the dead. Esaias on the 8th [:19-20]: **Shall not a people inquire of their God? Is it cheaper to ask the dead than the living? Yes, according to the law and the testimony, if they do not say this, they will not have the dawn.** So Luke 16 [:25]: Not only is it roundly denied to the rich glutton, since he asks that the soul of a deceased man be sent to his father's house to his brothers, but he is also told that it is impossible for any such soul to return. [:29] **They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them.** David, when his son dies, says in the 12th chapter of the 2nd book of Samuel [:23]: **an I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me.** Sirach on 38 [:21]: **No one comes back from death.** Luke 16 [:26]: **A great gulf is fixed.** From all of which it can be seen that the souls that appear from time to time are certainly all ghosts of the living devil, who are by no means to be trusted in such matters. That is why Luther rightly writes: If you have a rumbling spirit or poltergeist in your house who pretends that you should help him with masses, you should

certainly take him for a devil. No soul has ever appeared from the beginning of the world, nor would God have it. As St. Chrysostom also testifies to this on Matthew 26, Homily 29, where he writes thus:

Quod vero immolatorum hominum animae ipsis aruspibus cooperentur, unde mihi persuadebitur? an quia ipsos daemoneos clamare nonnunquam audisti, anima talis ego sum. Verum quoque haec oratio a fraude, atque deceptione diabolica est. Non enim anima defuncti est, quae ista dicit, sed Daemon, qui haec, ut audientes decipiat, fingit.

### Et post pauca:

**Quare vetularum haec verba temolentorum ducenda sunt, & puerorum terculamenta. Non enim potest anima corpore separata, in his regionibus errare: justorum enim animae in manu Dei sunt Peccatorum vero, post exitum, mox abducuntur, quod a Lazaro, & divite planum efficitur. Sed alibi quoque Dominus ait: Hodie animam tuam abste repentent: Non igitur potest anima, cum a corpore abscesserit, apud nos hic errare.**

That is:

Who will persuade you that the souls of men who have been sacrificed and slaughtered should help the prophets? Do you think that I should believe it because some have cried out? I am such and such a soul? No. For this speech certainly comes from the devil, who wants to deceive and capture people with cunning. For it is not the soul of the deceased that says this, but the devil himself, who invents it in order to deceive those who listen and pay attention to it.

And soon after:

Such words of poltergeists are only old and drunken wives' tales to frighten the children. For the soul, when it has departed from the body, cannot walk and wander again in this world, for the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God.

But the wicked souls are led away by the hour after their departure. As can be seen from poor Lazaro and the rich man. The Lord also says elsewhere, Luke 12 [:20]: **Today your soul will be demanded from you.** If the soul is demanded, it cannot walk and wander here on earth. Hence Chrysostom.

From all of this it is sufficiently evident that purgatory cannot be glossed over or thoroughly fortified from God's Word. Oh the pious, faithful God, the true shepherd of our souls, graciously grant that we may give heed to His Word and not to the words of men, to His Word and not to the words of ghosts and spirits. May He convert those who are to be converted, and blot out all the riotous spirits who set themselves up against His most Holy Word, for the sake of Jesus Christ. Amen.

## The thirteenth article. [ToC](#)

# x: Of Celibacy or Priestly Marriage.

What is the main dispute in this article.

It is not asked whether a priest who has the gift may live outside marriage. This is not denied, if only he does not otherwise mix with wicked women. Nor is it asked whether some, many or few priests remain unmarried, this is also confessed, nor is it asked whether *celibacy* in and of itself is a state pleasing to God, we likewise insist on this, but this is the main dispute, whether a priest with a clear conscience may not enter holy matrimony, live in holy matrimony, and whether this is detrimental to his soul's salvation, but whether his salvation is promoted if he remains and lives in *celibacy*, in the state of virginity. The popes say yes, we say no and can never again allow that priests should not be allowed to live in holy matrimony or be condemned by it.

For what reasons?

1. Holy matrimony is not an order instituted by men or by angels, but by God, the Holy Trinity, Himself, even before the fall of our first parents, which God also endowed with rich blessings and ordained as a means by which churches, schools and government are to be established. How can such a holy order be harmful to a priest's soul? Would this not be a mockery to the founder of the order?

2. God has for the most part created the nature of mankind and implanted it in such a way that it should become conjugal, since he says [Gen. 9:7]: **Grow and multiply**. No one has excepted or spoken: The clergy should not live in matrimony, should not be two in one flesh.

3. But rather the Holy Spirit testifies that the marriage state is an honorable state for all. To the Hebrews on the 13th [:4]: **Marriage should be kept honest among all, and the marriage bed undefiled**. If marriage is to be kept honest for all, why not for priests as well?

4. In Genesis, God says in chapter 2 [:18]: **It is not good that man should be alone; we will make him a helper to be with him**. If this passage does not also apply to the priests, it must follow that they are not human beings.

5. St. Paul in the first epistle to the Corinthians, the 7<sup>th</sup> chapter says [:2]: For the **sake of fornication let every man have his own wife. Every man, Unusquisq**. St. Paul does not exclude any priest.

6. On the contrary, he testifies in his writings that if a bishop does not have the gift of virginity, he may, indeed should, have his wife and be unimpaired in his office or salvation if he also has children, as is written in the first epistle to Bishop Timothy in chapter 3 [:2]: **A bishop is to be blameless as the husband of one wife who has obedient children with all honor**. It clearly states that a bishop can be blameless if he has his own wife and children. So in the epistle to Titus in the first chapter, verse 6, he testifies to just this. Because St. Paul allowed this, indeed commanded it, and wrote it by inspiration of the Holy Spirit, are we not to believe him?

7. Wherefore St. Paul testified of himself that he had power to lead a woman about, as St. Peter did in the first to the Corinthians in chapter 9 [:5]: **Have we not also power to lead about a sister, a wife, as the other apostles, and the Lord's brethren, and Cephas?** For although the popes say that St. Paul does not speak of the wife, but of other women who used to follow the apostles, helping and assisting them, this interpretation is quite wrong, for St. Paul boasts that he preached in vain without the help of other people. 1 Cor. 4 [:12]: Thus the women gave him nothing, and St. Paul says that it was not from women, as from many, but from **one woman**, who would have found it especially difficult to receive the apostle from her property. So also the apostle uses the word *circumducendi*, to circumvent, saying that he had power and right to lead away a woman. But the women who helped the apostles were not in the apostles' power, they were not led around by them, but followed the apostles themselves. But the fact that St. Paul also calls this wife a sister is a way of speaking, and the apostle has indicated how one should love wives, namely as a physical sister, from which some fathers have concluded that St. Paul had a wife. But that the popes say that even if he had one, he did not use her in marriage in the apostleship, is something that people of understanding understand well, as it is said inconsistently, without any clear proof.

8. If the marriage of priests and clergymen were so unjust, priests and clergymen would not have lived in the marriage state so many hundred years ago with the glory that they were not criminal, not impure, not condemned by it, and because one of the most distinguished papal scribes has spoken such words in open print: We offer to forfeit all, if they can show us a single example that has been approved by the Church of Christ for sixteen hundred years, we will present to them several undeniable, public examples for sixteen hundred and more years out of several thousand years, which they shall not deny or overthrow for eternity.

**Noah**, the preacher of righteousness (1 Peter 3 [*sic*: 2 Pet. 2:5]), was a righteous man without change, led a godly



life in his day and fathered three sons. In the 6th chapter Genesis [:10].

**Ezekiel** was a great, holy prophet of God, lived in wedlock, had a wife, as he himself says of her death Ezekiel 24 [:18]: While I was speaking to the people early in the morning, my wife died to me at night.

According to the law of the Lord, the **high priest** had to take a wife, beget children with her, and yet burn incense early every day in the tabernacle before the ark of the covenant. Exodus 30 [:19].

Wasn't **Moses** a great prophet? He had a wife, Ziporam. Exodus 2 [:18].

**Aaron** took as his wife Eliseba, the daughter of Amminadab, Nahasson's sister, who bore him Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar. Did the Church of God condemn this marriage of high priests and prophets?

**Zacharias** the priest was blameless before God. Luke 1 [:5] He had a wife, Elizabeth, who bore him a son, John the Baptist.

**St. Peter** was an apostle, had his wife. 1 Cor. 9 [:5]. Matth. 8 [:14]. For because he had a wife-in-law, he must also have had a wife.

**St. Philip** the Evangelist, one of the 7 Deacons, had his wife, from whom he begot four daughters who could prophesy. Acts 21 [:8-9].

St. Paul example has been drawn before.

**Timothy** and **Titus** were bishops and had wives, as the church histories attest.

*Gregorius Nyssenus*, a distinguished teacher, had his wife, as *Nicephorus* writes in the 19th chapter of Book 2.

*Hilarius*, the holy bishop around the year 350, had his wife and was not condemned for it, but a distinguished pope, *Mantuanus*, testifies that at that time God was not offended by the marriage of priests.

Non nocuit tibi progenies, non obstitit Uxor

Legitimo conjuncta toro, non horruit illa

Tempestate Deus thalamos, cunabula, taedas.

These examples are all clear and cannot be overturned. Where is the glorious speech that no single example of approved priests can be shown?

9. But I would like to know, because the popes consider marriage to be a sacrament which serves for the forgiveness of



sins, how they are to blame for not being allowed to use this sacrament, since otherwise the sacraments are such treasures that belong to the whole Church. In the sacrament of the Lord's Supper the word should mean all, all priests and ministers. In the sacrament of Matrimony the word should be all (in the 13th chapter of Paul on Hebrews), all the laity except the priests. These are indeed private interpretations, repugnant interpretations.

10. Finally, that we do not forbid marriage to the spiritual state, or to any state, we have the reason because St. Paul says that it is a doctrine of devils to forbid marriage. In first Timothy in chapter 4, where he writes thus [:1-3]: The Spirit clearly says that in the last times some will depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, through those who speak lies in deceitfulness and have a brand on their conscience, forbidding to **marry** and to abstain from the food which God has created. This doctrine, because it is a doctrine of devils, we do not wish to partake of, and conclude from this that whoever forbids to marry is introducing a doctrine of devils, and the apostle does not exempt the prohibition of priestly marriage from this.

So that I take the matter properly, do you reject virginity and *celibacy* in general?

No, not at all, but we say that whoever has this gift has a glorious, good gift and may use it with a clear conscience, should refrain from all immoral mixing and may also express himself in an honest marriage bed. But we reject the papal doctrine of *celibacy*, because it is in many ways contrary to the right doctrine of virginity and the single state. For the popes praise *celibacy*, but to the holy married state, bring shame and ridicule, saying that marriage is an unclean state, when St. Paul calls the marriage bed an undefiled bed. They say of *celibacy* that one who lives in this state earns eternal life; which is most vehemently opposed to the merit of Jesus Christ. The popes are also mistaken in thinking that anyone can have this gift if he only wants to. Since Scripture clearly testifies to this, even Christ Jesus himself, *Non omnes capiunt verbum hoc*, not everyone grasps this word.

Again, that they particularly want the priests to live in this state, whether God has granted them to have the gift or not. Furthermore, the popes still do not know what a true virginity is; they think that if one does not use marriage outwardly, that is enough. But the heart also belongs to it, that one should not burn in the heart, should not suffer heat. We cannot approve of this papal *celibacy*, because it is introduced against and without God's word. Luther testifies to it by all ten commandments with which he contends.

Against the I. For they make an idol of them, because this state is supposed to give and acquire eternal life for them.

They misuse the Scriptures of God for their false teaching.

Against the III. They make a special service out of it.

Against the IV. They enter the state without and against their parents' will.

Against the V. They are killing themselves, depriving themselves of their soul's salvation by placing their salvation and hope in *celibacy*.

For in the commandment the married state is sanctified, established, and confirmed. The popes condemn it among priests and generally speak of the marriage bed in a very derisive and scornful manner.

They live in idleness, toil and scrape, eat and drink, thus stealing what is their neighbor's, stealing from their parents the rights they otherwise have over their children.

Against the VIII. They bear false witness against holy matrimony.

Against the IX. and X. Have evil desire and lust in their hearts and say that evil desire is not a sin.

It is nevertheless certain that St. Paul, in the first epistle to the Corinthians in chapter 7 [:8], highly praises the single state, indeed prefers it to the married state?

We know very well that the holy apostle highly praises the unmarried state of virginity and in some ways prefers it to the married state, but he does not condemn the married state, he does not condemn the marriage of priests.

He does not give a commandment that one must, contrary to one's nature, express oneself in marriage; he also prefers the married state to the unmarried state in a certain way, since he says: **It is better to be free than to be in heat.** Again in the 6th verse he says [:1 Cor. 7:6]: What he has said up to this point about the virgin state, he says out of favor, not out of commandment. In the 35th verse: He desires no one to throw a rope around his neck. He leaves it to the discretion of each one whether he wants to be free or not free, according to each one's ability. In the 17th verse: As God has distributed to each one. In the 18th verse: Each one as the Lord has called him, so let him walk, and so I do in all churches. In the 36th verse: He does what he wants, he does not sin. These passages of St. Paul are all against the papal *celibacy orders*, and we are not mistaken that St. Paul says in this very chapter in verse 1: It is good for a man not to touch a woman. Who denies that, in the sense in which St. Paul means it, namely *propter necessitatem*, for the sake of the present need it is good for man to be so, he himself says in the 26th verse. At the time when St. Paul wrote these words, the Christians were in great, hard affliction, were not safe because they were chased away and driven out. In such distress it is of course better, if it can be, not to have a wife, because a single person can get on better in such affliction than one who has a wife and children. But what good is this passage about papal *celibacy*?

In verse 40 St. Paul says that the virgin is more blessed if she remains so. But he adds, in my opinion, lest anyone should think her more blessed than a married woman; that she may go to heaven sooner than the married, St. Paul nowhere says; that is not St. Paul's opinion. This is how he speaks of virgins. The popes refer it to priests, which is very inconsistent.

St. Paul speaks in verse 5: Whoever is not married has the best reason for fasting and praying?

Answer: St. Paul does not say this, for he speaks expressly of married couples in these words: Do not withdraw one from the other, unless by the consent of both for a time, that you may have leisure for fasting and prayer, and come together again.

It does not follow from this that married couples cannot pray in the marriage state, to which many thousands of people will testify, but the holy apostle speaks of **certain times of prayer** [\*de precibus solennibus\*](#), as it was customary to hold public prayers at times for several days in succession to avert a misfortune which one feared. This is what the apostle is referring to, so this passage cannot forbid priests to marry forever.

The 32nd and 33rd verses say: He who is single takes care of what belongs to the Lord, as it pleases the Lord, but he who is married takes care of what belongs to the world, as it pleases his wife.

These words do not imply that priests should not have wives, for they speak *indefinitely* and *generally* of the laity as well. But St. Paul does not mean to teach that married couples cannot serve God, since the fear of God is both commanded and praised for married couples.

Noah was married, yet he led a godly life. Gen. 5.

Zacharias and Elizabeth were married, but lived blamelessly before God. Luke 1. But the holy apostle wants to say this much: It is easier to serve God in the single state than in the married state, because a single person is free from all worries and other daily hindrances, but in the married state other worries, other toil, work and business come in, which do not displease God either. Furthermore, St. Paul actually sees how many misuse the married state and think too much of the carnal air, meanwhile forgetting their divine service, or getting caught up in other business and missing the divine service, but this happens *per accidens*, accidentally, not that the married state is guilty of this in itself, but that some people misuse it. If it were to follow from this that priests should not have wives because they cannot serve God, then it would follow: The priests and high priests, the prophets and apostles did not serve God because they were married: No layman or Christian can serve God if he is married. For St. Paul was not speaking of the priests *in particular*, but in general, as the text shows, for which reason these words of St. Paul are not to be understood without condition.

It would also follow that all those who are not married serve God, but this is not the case. Many of them live outside the married state, serve not God, but the devil, and are dead while they live. 1 Timothy 5.

Matthew 19 says [:12]: Some have married for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. To conclude from this that whoever is out of wedlock enters the kingdom of heaven deserves the kingdom of heaven.

The Lord Christ says in this chapter that not to marry is not for everyone, but only for those to whom it is given. He is threefold:

1. Some are eunuchs (*verschnitten*), born from the mother's womb.

2. Some of the people eunuchs, as it was customary to make such *eunuchs* at court.

3. But there are some who have cut themselves off for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. What is this? He wants to say this much: There are some who could be free, but are not, and have the gift that they can refrain from it, such ones cut themselves off for the sake of the kingdom of heaven: That is, that they may perform their office in the church of God (which is now and then called in Scripture the kingdom of heaven, Matthew 20, etc.) without all hindrance, without all other care. And thus says the Lord Christ soon afterward, whoever can grasp it, let him grasp it. He does not compel everyone to do it, but says: Whoever can or is able to do it, let him do it. But it is very ridiculous for them to think that this is the way to gain the kingdom of heaven. Such error comes from the fact that they do not understand the Scriptures and do not know that so often in the New Testament the kingdom of heaven is taken for the Christian church on earth, for the ministry of preaching, Matthew 13, Matthew 20, etc. With God there is no difference, when a married person dies in Christ, he attains eternal life by grace, which a single person attains, who must also have it by grace alone.

The popes say that if one only prays, everyone can circumcise himself and be advised to marry.

Christ Jesus says: Do not marry, do not stand with anyone, but only with those to whom it is given. Thus he testifies that it is given only to some, which St. Paul also says, that each one has his own

gift, which God has distributed to him, one this, another another. Concerning prayer, God gives everything we ask according to his word. But if he has called us to the married state and has ordained me or you to live in it, then I am not asking rightly when I ask for the gift of virginity, for I am asking against God's will and I do not know what I am asking for. So little it follows: If I ask God for the gift of healing, he will certainly give it to me, because he has given it to others, 1 Corinthians 12. It follows just as little that because God has given the gift of *celibacy* to others, he must therefore give it to me. These are *singularia dona*, special gifts, which God distributes as he wills, as he has called each one. There is another opinion about the gifts that God gives in general, such as forgiveness of sins, eternal life and salvation, which God gives to all who call upon him rightly in the name of Christ; without these gifts they cannot be saved, but without the gift of virginity many of them have been saved and can still be saved, which everyone must confess. It would be a matter for the popes to deny the salvation of souls to all married couples, but pious Christians would not turn to this, because the popes are not masters of heaven and it is not up to them to distribute heaven to whom they wish.

Can a man obtain the gift of chastity through prayer if his wife is sick or if she is taken prisoner?

This is again a special thing, for God has called them to this state. The God who has laid this burden on them also helps them to bear it and gives them grace so that they do not succumb to the cross he has laid on them. The logicians (*Logici*) would reject the popes with finesse: *Casus singulares, non faciunt Regulam generalem*. No general rule can be made from particular cases. In sum, they can get nowhere with their objections.

One more thing. They say: Although the apostles had wives, they left them in the apostleship or did not live with them in marriage.

They will never be able to explain this. Leaving a wife for the apostleship is nowhere to be seen, but this is what God says: A man should leave his father and mother and **cleave to** his wife. [Matthew 19:5]



Again: What God has joined together, let no man put asunder [Matthew 19:6]. Although it is said of the apostles that they forsook all things, this is not to be understood of the women. They left everything that they could leave without breaking God's commandments. But they could not leave the wives by virtue of God's commandment, for Christ says in the 19th chapter of Matthew [9]: Nothing shall put away marriage except adultery. He does not say that apostleship divorces marriage. It is also said elsewhere: Whoever leaves his wife for my sake, that is *de coacta desertione*, to be understood: when one is driven from wife and child by tyrants, because of the confession of Christ. But the apostles did not have such an opportunity, since they were called by Christ Jesus and told to follow him and leave everything, namely their nets and their handicrafts. Just as Lot left everything behind him in Sodom, but took his wife with him (*Genesis* 19 [:15]). But the fact that they did not live with their wives is not yet proven from Scripture. Marital concubinage is not forbidden and does not contradict the priesthood. The priests in the Old Testament attended their wives, and Christ says that one should attend his wife. St. Paul says: Do **not deprive one another**, neither priest nor layman. [1 Cor. 7:5]

Much *testimonia* and evidence could be introduced from the popes' own books, in which they clearly confess that the prohibition of priestly marriage is not a divine, but only a human commandment. As *Bellarminus* clearly confessed. Again: From their *Jure canonico*, spiritual law, in which it is said almost innumerable times that before this it was always right for priests to marry, that *Paphnutius* and the Council of Nicaea were right in not forbidding priests to marry. Again: That many popes are successively narrated in spiritual law, who have all been the sons of priests (*dist. 56. cap. Osius.*) One could also tell widely how this prohibition of priestly marriage, which St. Paul calls your doctrine of the devil, has always been gradually torn down and introduced by various damned heretics. Again: What an abomination and unspeakable disgrace arose from *celibacy* in the papacy, that in the nunneries in the 6,000 dead children and heads were found in the pond, as Bishop Ulrich confesses etc. But it would be far too long and is known to almost everyone,

so we will leave it at this for the sake of brevity. And yet we hope that every Christian has done more than enough in this dispute, and that our opponents will one day mend their ways, reflect, give glory to Christ and his holy word and convert to God, abandoning all new, proud, arrogant errors. [Fiat, fiat](#). (Let it be, let it be.)

## The fourteenth article. [ToC](#)

# Of the Roman Pope

## and thus of the Antichrist.

**M**any of our theologians have written about this article, quite thoroughly and in detail. Especially Mr. [Georgius Nigrinus](#) and [Dr. Daniel Cramerus](#), who proved irrefutably that the pope is the real Antichrist. Again, Mr. [Georgus Mylius](#) in his papal sermons, and the Protestants in their stately explanation, why they did not appear at the Council of Trent, before the highly enlightened man of God, Blessed Luther, in the book of the papacy at Rome, founded by the devil in the 8th part of the Jena edition. [[StL 17, 1019 ff.](#)]

For this reason, we will not go into it at length this time, but will refer the eager reader to reported books, in which they will see with their own hands that the pope is not who he claims to be and yet is who he refuses to be. However, in order to provide a necessary account of this point in this little handbook, we will summarize these two parts:

1. that the pope is not who he claims to be.
2. that he certainly is who he does not want to be.

This should be spoken of simply, briefly, and yet thoroughly. Pious Christians want to show respect and learn to recognize the animal.

## The first part. [ToC](#)

What is the Roman pope pretending to be?

(1) If he claims to be the **universal head of the church**, which he is not, for the true church is content with one head, which is Christ Jesus, whom alone the Scriptures praise as our head.

Ephesians on 1 [:22]: God has put all things under the feet of Jesus Christ and has **made him the head of the church** over all things, which is his body.

Chapter 4 [:16]: Let us be righteous in love and grow in all things in him who is our head, Christ. By whom the whole body is knit together, and the members hang together by every joint, one helping another.

In chapter 5 [:22-23]: Wives are subject to their husbands as to the Lord, for the husband is the head of the wife, just as Christ is the head of the church and the Savior of his body. To the Colossians in the first chapter: He (the Lord Jesus) is before all, and all things consist in him, and he is the head of the body, namely the church.

In the first epistle to the Corinthians, chapter 11 [:2]: I have espoused you *uni Viro*, to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ.. From this it follows irrefutably that Christ Jesus alone is the head and not the pope.

Christ may be the head in heaven, but the pope on earth.

Christ Jesus is the head in heaven and on earth, for he fills all things. Ephesians in chapters 1 and 4: He is present everywhere, even in the midst of his enemies he reigns, Psalm 110 [:2]. He reigns from sea to sea, Psalm 72 [:8]. And the Scripture does not know this difference between the heavenly and earthly head, but says that Christ is the head, namely of the church, which is gathered to him here on earth.

But because the church is a visible body, it must also have a visible head.

That does not follow. Can the church be without a visible God, without visible faith? Can it

be fed and watered with the true body and blood of Jesus Christ? Blessed are those who do not see and yet believe, John 20 [:29] Christ Jesus, who would be the Son of God, can do as much, even if he is not seen, as all men can never do who are seen.

What more does the Pope say?

On the other hand, he says that he is Christ Jesus' vicar because of St. Peter, to whom the rule of faith has been given. From whom the pope also received that whatever he wills in matters of faith must be done and his voice must be heard and accepted. But this the pope wrongly presumes, for neither St. Peter nor the pope is given such power and dominion over the consciences of men, again in matters of faith. The Holy Spirit is supreme over us in these matters; He does not direct us to the pope, but to the Holy Scriptures. Nowhere do we read that St. Peter presumed or used such authority, but he likewise directs us to the Scriptures, 1 Peter 4 [:11], 2 Peter 1 [:19-21]. Yes, St. Peter had to give way in matters of religion to St. Paul, who pointed out to him that he was not walking rightly according to the Gospel, to the Galatians 2 [:4]. If St. Peter had had such authority, he would not have allowed himself to be instructed by St. Paul.

Assuming (but not admitting) that St. Peter had such authority, it does not follow that therefore the popes have such authority; the popes are not apostles, as St. Peter was. But it is certain that neither Peter nor a pope has the power to dictate to us what we should believe according to their liking, but we are confined to Jesus Christ, who speaks in the Scriptures. Of Him the heavenly Father says: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, whom you shall hear, Matthew 17 [:5], not the pope. If we were to say in that day: Lord, the pope has commanded us: We are to believe thus. Then the heavenly Father would say: Who pointed you to the pope? I have pointed you to Jesus my Son. The Lord Jesus would say: I pointed you to my apostles and not to the pope.

What more does the Pope want to be?

He still insists that he is Christ's vicar. But a pious heart should take heed of this, so that such a veil may be removed from him even more. If the pope wants to boast that he is Christ's vicar in office, he must not speak or act contrary to his Lord Jesus Christ, otherwise he will not be a faithful vicar. But now the pope does many things against Christ, whose vicar he boasts to be, as an example:

Christ directs us to the Scriptures, comments on the Scriptures, and says that eternal life can be had from them, John 5 [:39]. The pope desecrates the Scriptures, saying that one cannot be sufficiently instructed from them for salvation.

Christ says: You serve me in vain with the teaching of men, Matthew 15 [:9]. The Pope, on the other hand, imposes so much human teaching on us and wants us to abandon God's commandment rather than his commandment.

Christ says: He that believeth **on him only** shall be saved, John 3 [:15], Mark 9 [:23]. The pope utterly condemns this doctrine.

The Lord Christ says: We can be sure of our salvation and forgiveness of sins, Matt. 9 [:1-8], John 6. The pope curses him who wants to conclude that he will be saved.

Christ says: Drink from it, all of you, Matthew 26 [:27], the Pope shouts: Don't all drink from it.

Christ honors holy matrimony with his presence, approves the marriage of his apostles. The pope does the opposite, despising marriage, calling it a carnal state in which one cannot please God.

Christ Jesus says: You have received it for free, you shall give it for free. The pope does not give forgiveness of sins unless money is given to him.

Christ rides on a donkey, which he borrows. Has not, as he lays down his head. The pope rides on high stately horses, is accompanied with stately pomp, sits in great wealth, holds his own court.

Christ comes to us poor and miserable, he is humble. The pope has seized the world's greatest treasure, is arrogant. Let emperor and king await his service.

Christ, when he was called to account for his teaching, gave an account. The pope wants to be without rules, *ex/lex* [outside the law], not to tolerate a man questioning him about his doctrine. Indeed, the papal law (*C. Sc. Papa. dist. 40.*) expressly states that if the pope were to forget his own salvation and the salvation of his brethren, were to be incompetent and negligent in his office, and were to conceal what is good, and moreover were to lead countless peoples in heaps into the abyss of hell with him, so that they and he would have to be afflicted for eternity with many stripes, then no mortal man should say to him: What are you doing?

Indeed, this is not a vicar of Jesus Christ who has such a low regard for the souls that Jesus Christ redeemed so dearly with his death.

Is the Pope still giving more of himself?

He says that he is the general judge in matters of faith, and that he should be followed in everything, even if he rejects something contrary to God's Word. For, as *Carolus Ruinus* writes (*Cons. 109. n. 1. lib. 5.*), the pope has the power to speak and write against St. Paul's epistles. But this is an atrocious blasphemy. How can a man be a general judge in matters of faith, since the articles of faith come from God? Is God then subject to the Pope, must God's Word be interpreted as the Pope wishes? All men are liars; if the pope is a man, he must also be one of them. We do not consider the pope to be the general judge of disputes, but the Holy Spirit, who does not settle disputes through the pope, but through the one, holy, divine Scripture, as stated above in the first article. God has directed us to his Son, not to the pope, to the law and for testimony. Much less, however, do we consent to the blasphemy that the pope has power to order against Paul's epistle. For St. Paul clearly says in Galatians 1 [:8]: If an angel from heaven brings a different gospel than the one he preached, let him be accursed. And how can the popes be infallible judges when they themselves have accepted damnable heresies and have been tainted with other abominable, unchristian, ungodly vices, shame and sins? Yes, because the pope is the Antichrist himself, as

will soon be proven, should the Antichrist be accepted as the general judge?

Will he be content with that?

Not at all, but he says that he is also a temporal lord, and indeed the overlord over the emperor, over all Protestants and men on earth. Hence Pope Clement V boasted that just as gold is nobler and better than lead, so papal majesty is greater than imperial majesty. Just as the sun is seven and forty times greater than the moon, so the pope is greater than the emperor. Therefore the popes took away their power, that they went with feet from the heads of the Roman emperors. Again: the emperors were forced to take an oath that they would be faithful to the pope.

And how the pope rises in worldly splendor, in the glory of the world, can easily be deduced from the papal ceremonial book, for there it is commanded that all men, no matter whose rank and dignity they may be, if they are staying where the pope is, as soon as they see the pope and he allows them to come, they should kiss his feet. If, however, it should happen that the pope should wish to ride in his procession, and a king or emperor should happen to be present at that time, he should be obliged, when the pope wishes to saddle up, to hold his left hand and help him up, and then take the horse by the bridle and lead him a long way with his right hand. If, however, the pope would not have the opportunity to ride, but to be carried in his armchair, then every emperor or king present at that time should be obliged to step up next to his bearers, take the poles on his armpit, and thus carry and drag the pope away, sitting up in his armchair. If the pope then wished to dine, every king or emperor present was obliged to pour out the water for him when he washed himself, and also to serve and prepare the first dish and the first course with other table servants. And who wants to recount all that the Roman bishops presume to do in worldly matters? They want to install and depose emperors, all goods are to be fiefdoms of the pope, the pope may not be subject to anyone, but all people are to be subject to him,

all emperors and kings, he has the spiritual and the secular sword, etc.

What do you think now, dear Christian, can the pope say that he has such power from God's Word? Nevermore. Ah, the dear Lord Jesus Christ says: He did not come to be served, but to serve others, Matthew 20 [:28]. He did not submit to worldly rule, since they wanted to make him king, John 6 [:15], he flees and escapes. To Pilate, John. 18 [:36], he says: His kingdom is not of this world. Luke 12 [:13-14]. they spoke to him that he wanted to discuss the dispute about the brotherly inheritance; Christ does not want to be involved in world trade. He has not withdrawn himself from the worldly authorities, but has given them their charge, their bosom and treasure. He warned his apostles that they should not submit to any worldly rule, Matthew 20 [:25-26], Luke 22. Worldly kings rule, and the mighty are called gracious lords. But you are not so. And Christ said to Peter, put your sword into its sheath, so that he might make it clear that he did not want St. Peter or the clergy to usurp the worldly sword. Which he hereby also indicates, saying John 20 [:21]: As my Father sends me, so I send you. But his Father did not send him as a worldly lord. So Christ Jesus did not send his disciples as worldly lords and potentates. This is why the Roman pope, without any divine right, takes away his authority in worldly matters. St. Paul says: Let every man be subject to the authorities, etc. Rom. 13 [:1] The pope is not excluded, no one is excluded, no prophet, no apostle, as St. Chrysostom says.

Thus the pope is *de jure* not who he claims to be, and no Christian is obliged to take him for who he wants to be of his own free will.

The popes prove, especially their primacy, from Christ's saying in the 16th chapter of Matthew [:18]: You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and I will give you the keys to heaven, etc.". From this they inferred that Peter was made the head of the Church, on whom the Church was founded. But the popes are heirs of St. Peter's throne, which is why they are justly subject to this primacy.

One can hardly refrain from laughing at the proof. Where does it say in this text that Peter should be such a



pope, should have such power as the popes now have? Well, then, since the popes lay most of their foundation on this passage, let us see how it applies to their cause, namely, like a coil in a sack.

The Lord Christ had asked the apostles what they thought of Christ, for whose Son did they recognize him? Then St. Peter answered on behalf of the others: You are the Christ, the Son of the living God. Christ said: This confession is right. Flesh and blood had not revealed this to him. He is on the right path, founded on the right foundation. Jesus Christ therefore says: You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. The Lord Christ does not say: *Tu es petra*, you Peter are a rock, no, but you are Peter, a man of rock, who has founded your soul on the right rock, namely on Christ. Just as the Scriptures, in clear, bright, explicit words, calls Christ Jesus the rock and the cornerstone, Isaiah 28 [:16], in the 118th Psalm [:2]. In the 2nd chapter of First Peter [:6]. And St. Paul says in First Corinth. 3 [:11]: **No other foundation can be laid than that which is laid, Jesus Christ.** And to the Ephesians in chapter 2 [:20]: **You have been built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, since Jesus Christ is the cornerstone.** For this reason Christ does not say that St. Peter is the rock, but that **Christ is the rock.** 1 Corinthians, chapter 10 [:4]. Otherwise the church also would have been mightily ill provided for, because if St. Peter had died, her head would have died, and would follow that Christ's word would not be true, since he says: The gates of hell shall not prevail against thee. For of course St. Peter was overcome when he denied Christ his passion, which is why Christ calls him Satan in this very 16th chapter [Matt. 16:23]; Christ's church will not be founded on Satan. He was overcome because he so shamefully denied Christ Jesus. This clearly shows how Christ does not build his church on St. Peter. And there is reason here, because Christ also belongs to the church as the head, just as it is impossible that Christ should first base himself on a mortal man, or that the church should rely on mortal men. Cursed be the one who lays a foundation other than the one laid by Jesus Christ.

Concerning the other words: I will give you the keys, etc. Nor can it be proved from this that such papal authority was given to St. Peter. For Christ, Matthew 18 and John 20, gives this same power to all the apostles at the same time, not to St. Peter alone, it can be seen from this that St. Peter was given no preference. For Christ certainly did not want one of them to be pope. Otherwise, if he had wanted St. Peter to be pope, he would have said to the disciples that Peter should be the greatest, when they asked him [Matt. 18:1-4], Lord, who is to be the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? All this does not mean that Christ bound the papacy to Rome, because St. Peter did not become bishop in Rome, nor did he remain there, but went into all the world as Christ commanded. That is, he had to go and preach from time to time, but Rome had not brought St. Peter to faith.

Furthermore, even if St. Peter had been bishop of Rome, which can never be thoroughly proven, it does not follow that he was such a pope as the present popes. And since the popes want to refer to Peter, they must teach and live as St. Peter taught, lived, walked and acted in his preaching office. But if one compares St. Peter and the popes, it is easy to see how they agree with each other, namely, as light and darkness, as righteousness and unrighteousness.

St. Peter says in the 4th chapter of the Apostolic Histories [Acts 4:12]: There is no other name given by which one can be saved than the name of **Jesus**. And in chapter 10 [:43]: All the prophets testify to this Jesus, that in his name all who believe in him will receive forgiveness of sins. The pope does not attribute salvation to this one Jesus, but to masses, indulgences, pilgrimages, monastic vows, the merits of the saints, St. Mary, St. Francis, St. Dominic, etc.

St. Peter recognizes Christ as the one cornerstone and rock of the churches, 1 Peter 2 [:6] The pope proclaims himself to be the rock and cornerstone.

St. Peter alone calls Christ the arch-shepherd of our souls, 1 Peter 5 [:4]. The pope calls himself thus and pretends that he is the arch-shepherd of souls.

St. Peter points us to the Scriptures, whoever wants to speak, let him speak God's Word. The Pope directs us from the Word, from Scripture to his essays, decrees and own traditions.

St. Peter says [1 Pet. 5:2]: Do not feed the flock for the sake of shameful gain; the pope is most cruel and abominable, he does everything for money, Mass for money, forgiveness of sins for money.

St. Peter is angry with those who live in lust, 2 Pet. 2 [:10]. The pope has mostly such clergymen who live in pure lust, and he, the pope himself, lives in lust up to his ears, commits bankruptcy, fornicates, etc. Just as the other priests do.

St. Peter was simple, not highly decorated, the Pope's majesty is unspeakable.

St. Peter calls himself a fellow elder. 1 Pet. 5 [:1]: The pope is supreme over the whole clergy.

St. Peter says [1 Peter 5:3]: The priests should not rule over the flock, the pope is sovereign over all the laity.

St. Peter has had his wife and has married her, Matth. 8 [:14], 1 Cor. 9 [:5]. The pope condemns the marriage of priests.

St. Peter, when the lame blind man approached him for alms, said [Acts 3:6]: I do not have gold and silver, the pope has enough gold and silver, more than many emperors, more than many kings and princes have, which is why Pope John 22nd alone left two hundred and fifty tons of gold in his treasury. Does that also mean: I don't have gold and silver?

St. Peter scolded Simon, the sorcerer, because he wanted to buy the gift of the Holy Spirit for money, Acts 8 [:18]. The pope scolds no one, but rather writes his letters, in which he offers to sell forgiveness of sins, heaven and eternal salvation for money. Now since the popes are so unlike St. Peter, why should they draw the holy apostle into their papal guild, who speaks, writes and has lived, walked and acted much differently from the popes? From this it is obvious that the popes cannot prove and establish their papacy of St. Peter with any reason.

Let this much be said of the first part, that the pope is not who he claims to be. He is not the supreme bishop of all teachers, he is not Christ's, nor Peter's

vicar, or heir to the throne. He is not a secular lord over all empires and kingdoms etc. He is not a general judge in matters of faith, etc.

## The second part. [ToC](#)

What does Junker Pope not want to be?

He does not want to be the great Antichrist of whom the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments prophesy, since everything that has been proclaimed about the great Antichrist who sits in the Church of God is fulfilled in him.

1. Daniel says in chapter 11 [\[:36\]](#): He will do as he pleases and will rise up and rebel against everything that is God, and against the God of all gods he will speak abominably. This has been amply fulfilled in the pope, for that he does what he wills is confessed by the papal scribes themselves innumerable times; that he exalts himself against and above God is evident, because he sets his commandment, his doctrine above and against God's commandment. Because he wants to be the one who may speak against Paul's epistles and exalt his mandate over them. Now the epistles of Paul, like the other canonical books, were not produced by human will, but driven by the Holy Spirit, spoken by the holy men of God, from which it is evident that whoever exalts himself above and against the Scriptures exalts himself above and against the living God himself. For all Scripture is from God. 2 Timothy 3 [\[:16\]](#).

2. Scripture says of the Antichrist that he will sit in the temple of God, that is, he will not be among the Turks, the Jews or the Gentiles, but will have his residence and abode in Christendom. 2 Thess. 2 [\[:4\]](#), which is clearly and obviously fulfilled in the Roman pope, who sits in the midst of Christians and presides over all Christendom.

3. Scripture also tells us the place where the Antichrist will have his court camp. Dan. 12 [\[Dan. 11:45\]](#). Between two seas he will pitch the tent of his palace. Rev. 17 [\[:1\]](#) In such a city, which has the kingdom over the kings

of the earth, which is situated on seven mountains, this will be completely fulfilled in the pope. It sits between two seas, the Tyrrhenian and the Adriatic. The city of Rome, where he has his court camp, is situated on seven different mountains, as the histories and the evidence testify. In it he has his castle of angels, his palaces, pleasure palaces and tents, much more splendid and magnificent than those of an emperor or king. This characteristic betrays the pope horribly, that he is the real Antichrist.

4. In the Revelation of John 13 [: ] it is written: The country and language of the Antichrist has such a name that when the letters of the same name are multiplied by numbers, they will give such a number as six hundred and sixty-six. This sign is fulfilled in the pope, because the language name is the word *λατειτοζ*, as St. Irenaeus calculated 1400 years ago. Since the number of 666 is exact, and the pope is a *Latinus*, an elector, sits in *Latio*, which is his mother tongue, he will not allow any language other than Latin to be used in the performance of his divine service, nor will he suffer the articles of faith to be confirmed from any Bible other than Latin.

5. Daniel 12: Instead of the true God and worship, the Antichrist will have a special god, of whom his fathers knew nothing, who will be called *Mausim*, whom he will honor with gold, silver, precious stones and jewels. What can be said more clearly about the pope? I mean, he has his own special god, of whom his father knew nothing, namely *Mausim*, the mass. Who knew anything about the papal mass 1000 years ago? The devil and the pope devised such a sacrifice, raised up such a god, which they honor with gold, silver and precious stones, which they enclose in a stately golden monstrance, and in sum, this sign is so clearly fulfilled by the pope that no man who only knows the papal mass may deny it.

6. St. Paul also describes the Antichrist thus: that his future will be with all kinds of lying powers, signs and wonders. 2 Thess. 2 [:9], which of course is also evident in the pope. There is no heresy that has defied signs and wonders as the pope has done. He is full of

miracles and wonders. And yet his miracles are all lies, just as the Jesuits delicately lie to the world that one may not have sharp questions.

7. Daniel 12 [[Daniel 11:37](#)] says of Antichrist that he will not respect the love of women, that is, conjugal love, which St. Paul interprets 1 Timothy 4 [[:1-3](#)] to mean that he will introduce the doctrine of the devil and forbid marriage. Chapter 4 thus interprets: He will introduce the doctrine of the devil and forbid marriage, does not the pope do this? Of course, he does not respect the chaste love of women, of course he forbids marriage, as reported in the previous article. On the other hand, he has his pleasure in harlotry, in silent sins, in foul weddings, in Florentine short cuts [[?](#)], in sodomitic abominations. As has been amply explained elsewhere.

8. Furthermore, the Antichrist is to be recognized by the prohibition of the food which God has created. 1 Timothy. 4 [[:3](#)]. that this mark is clearly fulfilled in the pope, the children of 7 or 8 years know to God's praise, for he certainly forbids the food, meat, cheese, butter, eggs, bacon, etc., which people may not use at certain times under penalty of banishment.

9. Revelation gives another sign by which the Antichrist is to be known, *Apocalipsis* 17 [[:6](#)], namely: He will be drunk with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the witnesses of Jesus. That is, he will shed an unspeakable amount of Christian blood. Oh, God have mercy in heaven, how evidently this sign has been fulfilled in the pope, how many thousands of people have been killed, hanged, beheaded, burned, boiled, impaled and inflicted with all kinds of torture by his tyrants. Who on that day will accuse the pope with an intrepid mouth and testify to their innocence before Christ Jesus. Indeed, even today he will not stop shedding blood and murdering the evangelical Christians.

Since these signs are all irresistibly fulfilled in the pope, it must necessarily follow that he is the real Antichrist. For this reason the pope has been considered the Antichrist not only by us Evangelicals, but several hundred years ago, for *Aventinus*, the historian, reports that Pope John the 22nd was declared the Antichrist by the entire Roman Empire, secular and spiritual. Eberhard, the bishop of Salzburg [[Wikipedia?](#)], proclaimed the pope to be the

Antichrist before the whole empire 200 years ago. *Aventinus* writes that most godly people consider Pope Gregory the 7th to have begun the kingdom of Antichrist, and in sum, that the Pope is Antichrist is as evident as it is evident that twice three is six.

The Antichrist will come shortly before the Last Day, 3 years and 6 months, so the Pope is not the Antichrist.

That the Antichrist will only come so shortly before the Last Day can never be proven from Scripture, because St. Paul testifies in 2 Thess. 2 that the Antichrist was already pregnant with his evil deeds in his time. And John says in 1 Epistle 4 [:3] that the Antichrist was already present. It is indeed reported that he is to come in the last days, but the Scriptures call the last days the time from the birth of Christ until the last day, as it says in the second chapter of the first epistle of John [:18]: Children, now is the last hour. Even if it were certain that the Antichrist would reign 3 years and 6 months before the last day, we could actually know the time of the last judgment, since Christ says that we cannot and should not know it.

St. Paul, 2 Thess. 2 [:3], calls the Antichrist a man, the man of sin, speaks of only one man. But the popes are many, therefore the popes cannot be Antichrist.

St. Paul says: The man of sin, but this does not prove that he is speaking of only one person, for the Scriptures use the term "one man" to mean many people. 1 Corinthians 11 [:28] Paul says: But let a man examine himself. This is exactly what man is, and yet St. Paul speaks of many persons. Matthew, chapter 12 [:35]: A good man brings good things from the good treasure of his heart. Matthew, chapter 4 [:4]: Man does not live by bread alone. Matthew chapter 2 [Mark 2:27]: The Sabbath was made because of man and not man because of the Sabbath, from which it is evident that often, and never the word man is not to be understood of one person, but of many of the same species (*eiusdem speciei*). It is evident from this that Paul did not mean to imply only one person by the word man, because he says that the wickedness of the Antichrist was already being realized at that time, and yet the Antichrist will not be put to death until the Last Day.

Is it possible that a man should now live from the time of Paul to the Last Day? And if he was already in the days of Paul, so name him the popes who is the same man? **The eternal man.** But their objection is a shambles. They themselves, when they write in their books what privileges the pope has, put it badly, saying "the pope", and yet understand it not only to refer to one person, but to all popes, that is the common way of speaking.

It is said of the Antichrist that he will destroy the temple. The pope does not do that.

The Antichrist will spiritually destroy the temple of God, as Daniel foretold. And this the pope does honestly, he has destroyed and confused the whole service of God, he has removed the right teaching from his temple as it is in the day, and this is called destroying the temple.

The Antichrist should abolish the eternal sacrifice, the Pope does not.

The pope obviously does this. The eternal sacrifice in the New Testament is the propitiatory sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ, which he offered on the cross. The Pope abolishes this sacrifice and focuses on his sacrifice of the Mass, saying that the Mass is the eternal sacrifice, not the propitiatory sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross. This is why the Pope must not pull his head out of the noose, as if he were not Antichrist. He is and remains so with his eternal damage.

We will leave it at that for now and let this present book be the end of it.

But we testify, as well as our adversaries with the same words, with thorough truth, from the bottom of our hearts, without hypocrisy and deceit, first of all toward God, that in this we have had nothing but God's honor and the promotion of the Christian faith all along from us and in our minds and faces, and have willingly not added certain false words. Secondly, that we do not wish to have any imperial, royal, electoral, princely, count, or honorable person, or any of the papists' authorities, reviled in any way with small words or thoughts, but only with the followers of the clergy, monks, Jesuits, priests, and teachers,



of whom we declare ourselves protesting vehemently (*sclenniter protestanto*), from our conscience and toward God.

And if I am prepared to confess and affirm this my confession without fear, not only here before men, but also there before the judgment seat of Jesus Christ with joy, I hope not to be put to shame, but to attain the end of my faith, which is eternal salvation, by grace. May God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the one, true and highly praised God for ever and ever, help me to achieve this. Amen.

End of this book.

To God alone the honor,  
The Jesuits count no more.

---

[This letter may be also found in the reference links in the *American Edition*, and the *St. Louis Edition* (German translated into English. However Hoe's emphasis of wording is one benefit of following the below translation.)]

## Letter from Dr. Martin Luther. [ToC](#)

Since we have above [[p. 46](#)] promised to set forth the glorious and beautiful letter of Luther, which he wrote alone on account of the little word *Sola*, the same follows from word by word as it is recorded in *5th Tom. Jen. 140*. etc. [[AE 35, 182-202](#); [StL 19, 968-985](#)]

To the honorable and prudent N., my esteemed lord and friend.

Grace and peace in Christ, honorable, prudent, dear Lord and friend. I have received your writing with the two questions or inquiries in which you desire my report. First, why I have thus translated the words of St. Paul in the epistle Rom. 3 [[:28](#)]: *Arbitramur hominem justificari ex fide absq. operibus legis*: **We hold that man is justified without the work of the law, through faith alone**. And besides this, you show how the papists make themselves useless above the masses, because the word *sola* (**alone**) is not in the text of Paul, and such an addition is not to be suffered by me in God's words, etc. Secondly, do the departed saints also pray for us? Because we read that the angels pray for us, etc.

To the first question, where do you feel like it, you may answer your papists for my sake thus: First, if I, Dr. Luther, could have assured myself that the papists were all at once so skillful that they could rightly and well translate a chapter in the Scriptures, I would indeed have allowed myself to be found humble and asked them for help and assistance in translating the New Testament. But because I knew and still see before my eyes that no one really knows how to interpret or speak German, I spared them and myself to such an effort. You can see that they speak and write German from my interpreting and learning German, and so they steal my language, of which they knew little before, but do not thank me for it, but would much rather use it against me. However, I do not begrudge them this, for it does me good that I have also taught my ungrateful disciples, and my enemies, how to speak.

Secondly, you may say that I have translated the New Testament to the best of my ability and conscience, have not forced anyone to read it, but have left it free and given it to those who cannot do better. No one is forbidden to do better. If anyone does not want to read it, let him leave it, I ask and urge no one to do so. It is my will and my interpretation and shall remain and be mine. If I have made a mistake in it (which I was not aware of and certainly did not want to deliberately misinterpret a letter), I will not suffer the papists to judge, for they still have long ears and their Ika, Ika [hee-haws] is too weak to judge my interpretation.

I know well, and they know it less than the miller's beast, what art, diligence, reason and understanding belong to a good interpreter, for they have not tried it. It is said that he who builds by the way has many masters, and so it is with me. Those who have never been able to speak properly, let alone interpret, are all my masters and I must be their disciple. And if I had asked them how to translate the first two words of Matthew's first chapter, *Liber generationis*, you would not have known how to say Quack! and the

fine fellows now judge the whole work for me. So it was with St. Jerome, when he interpreted the Bible, when all the world was his master, and he alone could do nothing. And the good man was judged by those who were not enough for him, that they should have wiped his shoes. That is why great patience is needed if someone wants to do something publicly good, for the world wants to remain the master of the horse and must always bridle the horse under its tail. To master everything and not be able to do it herself, that is her way, and she cannot let go of it.

I would still like to see the papist who stands out and translates an epistle of St. Paul or a prophet, provided that he does not use Luther's German and interpretation. There one should see a fine, beautifully praiseworthy German or interpretation. For we have seen the Sudler at this place, who mastered my New Testament (I will not mention his name in my books, for he has his judge and is otherwise well known), who confessed that my German was sweet and good, and saw well that he could do no better, and yet wanted to disgrace it. He went and took for himself my New Testament almost from word for word, as I had done it. And did my preface, glosa and name of it, wrote his name, preface and glosa to it, thus selling my New Testament under his name. Dear children, how woeful it was for me when his prince condemned me with an atrocious preface and forbade me to read Luther's New Testament. But he also ordered me to read Sudler's [Dresden scribbler's, Jerome Emser's] New Testament, which is the same one that Luther made!

And lest anyone here should think I am lying, take both testaments for yourself, Luther's and Sudler's, hold them up against each other, and you will see who is the interpreter in both, for what he has embroidered and altered in a few places (although I do not like it all), I can nevertheless bear it well and it does me no particular harm, as far as the text is concerned, which is why I have never wanted to write against it, but have had to laugh at the great wisdom that my New Testament has been so horribly blasphemed, condemned, forbidden, because it went out under my name, but still have to read how it went out under someone else's name

went forth. However, what a virtue it is to blaspheme and desecrate another's book, then steal it and still go out under one's own name, and thus seek eternal praise and name through another's blasphemed work, that I will let his judge find. However, it is enough for me and I am glad that my work (as St. Paul also praises) must also be promoted by my enemies and that Luther's book, without Luther's name, must be read under his enemies' names, how could I take revenge?

And that I come to the point again, if your pope wants to make himself much useless with the word *Sola*, **alone**, so tell him quickly thus: Dr. Martin Luther wants to have it thus and says: Papist and donkey be one thing, Thus I will, thus I command, thus the will for reason. (*Sic volo, sic jubeo, sic pro ratione voluntas*). For we do not want to be the papists' pupils or disciples, but their masters and judges; we want to be proud of them and beat their donkey heads. And as Paul boasts against his great saints, so will I boast against these my asses. You are doctors? So am I. You are scholars? So am I. You are preachers? So am I. Are you a theologian? So am I. Are you a disputator? So am I. Are you a philosopher? So am I. You are dialectici? So am I. You are lecturer? Me too. You write books? Me too.

And will continue to boast. I can interpret psalms and prophets, they cannot. I can interpret, they can't. I can read the scriptures, they can't. I can pray, they can't. And that I come down, I can understand their own dialectics and philosophies, for they themselves are all of them, and know for a fact that none of them understands their aristotelianism. And if there is one among them all who understands a *proem* or chapter in Aristotle properly, I will let myself be bruised. I will not talk too much now, for I have been educated and experienced in their art from my youth. Knowing almost well how deep and wide it is, they also know well that I know and can do everything they can. The wretched people still act towards me as if I were a genius in their art, who only arrived this morning and have never seen or heard what they teach or can do. They even come in splendidly with their art, and teach me what I tore to shreds twenty years ago, that I must also sing with that metzen to all their plerren and

cries: **I knew seven years ago that horseshoe nails are iron.**

That is the answer to your first question, and I beg you, do not answer such asses in any other way to their useless babbling about the word *Sola*, because Luther wants it that way and says: He is a doctor above all doctors in the whole papacy, so let it stay that way. I will henceforth despise and will despise them as long as they are such people (I would say) asses. For there are such impudent drops among them, who have never learned their own, the sophist's art, like Dr. Schmied [Faber] and Dr. Rotzlöffel [Cochlaeus] and their like. And yet they oppose me in this matter, which is not only above sophistry, but also (as St. Paul says) above all the world's wisdom and reason. It is true that a donkey should not sing much, otherwise it is well known among the rulers.

But I will show you and ours why I wanted to use the word (*Sola*). Although in Rom. 3. I did not use *sola* but *solum*, or *tantum*. So the donkeys regard my text as fine, but I have used it elsewhere *sola fide*, and also want to have both *solum* and *sola*. I have taken to interpreting so that I can give pure and clear German. And it has often happened to us that we have spent a fortnight, three or four weeks, trying to find a single word, and yet sometimes we have not found it.

So in Job we are working, Mr. Philips and I, Auregallus, that in four days we could sometimes barely finish three lines. Better, now that it is translated and prepared, a cedar can read and master it. If one now runs his eyes through three or four leaves and does not even bump into them, but does not realize what piles and clods are lying there, as he now walks over them as over a hoofed board, we must sweat and fear before we clear such piles and clods out of the way, so that one could walk so finely. It is good to plow when the field is clean. But to uproot the forest and the sticks and clear the field, no one wants to do that. There is no thanks to be earned from the world, for God himself cannot earn any thanks with the sun, even with heaven and earth, nor with the death of his own Son. Let it be and remain the world in the devil's name, because it wants nothing else.

So here, Rom. 3, I knew very well that the Latin and Greek texts do not contain the word (*solum*), and that the papists should not have taught me this. As it is, these four letters (*S o l a*) are not in it, which letters the donkey's heads look at like the cows look at a new gate, but do not see, which nevertheless has the opinion of the text in it, and where one wants to translate it clearly and violently, it belongs in it, because I wanted to speak German, not Latin or Greek, since I had intended to speak German in interpreting. But that is the way of our German language, when a speech is made about two things, one of which is confessed and the other denied, then one needs the word *solum*, **alone**, next to the word (not or none). As if one says, the farmer brings all grain and no money. **Again**, I truly have not money now, but only grain, I have eaten alone and have not yet drunk. Did you write alone and not read over? And the like in countless ways in daily use.

Yes, all of these passages, even if the Latin or Greek language does not do it, the German language does and it is its way that it adds the word (**alone**), so that the word (not or no) is all the more complete and clear. For although I say, the farmer brings grain and no money, the word (no money) is not as complete and clear as when I say, the farmer brings only grain and no money, and here the word (**only**) helps the word (no) so much that it becomes a complete German clear speech. ¶ For one does not have to ask the letters in the Latin language: How should one speak German, as the donkeys do. Rather, one must ask the mother in the house, the children in the streets, the common man in the market, and look them in the mouth as they speak and then interpret, so that they understand and realize that one is speaking German to them.

As when Christ speaks: *Ex abundantia cordis os loquitur*. [Matt. 12:34, Luk 6:45] If I am to follow the donkeys, they will lay the letters for me and thus interpret: Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks. Tell me, is this spoken in German? What German understands this? What kind of German is abundance of the heart? No German can say that. He would say: Unless one has too big a heart, or too much heart, although that

is not right either, for excess of the heart is not German, any more than that is German, excess of the house, excess of the tiled stove, excess of the bank, but thus speaks the mother in the house, and the common man: *Weß das Herz voll ist, deß gehe Mund über*. This is called speaking good German, that I have not reached and unfortunately not met all the way, because the Latin letters prevent us so much from speaking good German.

So when Judas the betrayer says in Matthew 26 [:8], *Ut quid perditio haec?* And Mark 14 [:4]: *Ut quid perditio ista unguenti facta est?* If I follow the donkeys and literalists, I must therefore translate it, why has this loss of the ointments happened? But what kind of German is this? Which German speaks thus: Loss of the ointment has happened? (*Verlossung der Salben ist geschehen?*) And if he understands it well, he thinks that the ointment is lost, and that he must seek it again, although that is still dark and uncertain. Now if this is good German, why do they not come forward and make us such a fine pretty new German Testament, and leave Luther's Testament? I think they should bring their art to light. But the German man speaks thus: *Ut quid &c.* What is the use of such nonsense? Or what is the harm of such? **Again:** it is a pity for the ointment. This is good German, from which one understands that Magdalene had handled the spilled ointment unrighteously and had done harm. That was Judah's opinion, for he intended to take better counsel with it.

Again: When the angel greets Mary and says Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord with thee. Well, so far it has been badly Germanized according to the Latin letters. But tell me, is this also good German? Where does the German man say thus: Thou art full of grace? And what German understands what is said, voll Gnaden? He must be referring to a barrel full of beer, or a bag full of money, which is why I have Germanized it: *Du holdselige*, so that a German can think all the more about what the angel means by his greeting. But here the papists want to be mad at me that I have spoiled the Protestant greeting, even though I have not used the best German. And I should have used the best German here, and thus Germanized the greeting: God greet you, dear Mary (for that is what the angel wants to say, and that is what he would have said

if he had wanted to greet her in German), I think they should have thought for themselves, for great devotion to dear Mary, that I had so ruined the greeting.

But, what do I ask about it, they rave or rave? I will not prevent them from translating what they want, but I will also translate not as they want, but as I want, whoever does not want it, let me have it, and keep his mastery to himself, for I will neither see nor hear it, they must not answer for my interpreting, nor give an account, that you may hear, I will say: You blessed Mary, you dear Mary, and let them say: You full of grace Mary. Whoever knows German knows well what a heartfelt and fine word this is, the dear Mary, the dear God, the dear emperor, the dear prince, the dear man, the dear child, and I do not know whether the word love can be spoken as heartfelt and sufficiently in Latin or other languages to penetrate and resound in the heart, through all the senses, as it does in our language.

For I think that St. Lucas, as a master of both the Greek and the Ebrew language, has intended to meet the Ebrew word used by the angel with the Greek *Kechaiitonicni* and to give it clearly. And think me, the narrow one! Gabriel spoke to Mary as he speaks to Daniel, and calls him *Hamudoth* and *isch Hamudoth vir desideriorum*, das is, you dear Daniel, for that is Gabrieli's way of speaking, as we see in Daniel. Now if I were to translate the angel's word from the donkey's art according to the letters, I would have to say: Daniel, you man of desires, or Daniel, you man of lusts, oh that would be beautifully German. A German may well hear that lusts or lust are German words, although they are not pure German words, but lust and desire would be better. But when they are summarized in this way, thou man of lusts, no German knows what is said, thinks that Daniel is perhaps full of evil lust, that would be called fein gedolmetschet.

Therefore I must here let the letters go, and inquire how the German man speaks such things as the Hebrew man speaks *ish Hamudoth*, so I find that the German man speaks thus, thou dear Daniel, thou dear Mary, or, thou lovely maid, lovely maiden, thou tender woman, and the like, for he who would interpret must have a great store of words, that he may have the choice where one will not read in all places.



And what shall I say much and long about interpreting? If I were to indicate the causes and thoughts of my words, I should probably have a. I should have a year to write about it: What an art, toil and labor interpreting is, I have well experienced, therefore I will not suffer a pope's ass or a mule, who have tried nothing, to be judge or reprover in this. Whoever does not want my interpreting, let him have it, the devil thank him, whoever dislikes it or masters it without my will and knowledge. If it is to be mastered, then I will do it myself, if I do not do it myself, then let me do my interpreting in peace and let everyone do what he wants for himself and have a good year.

**I can testify with a clear conscience that I have shown my utmost faithfulness and diligence in it and have never had any wrong thoughts, for I have not taken a penny for it, nor sought nor gained anything by it. Thus I have not meant my honor in it, God knows, my Lord, but have done it for the service of the dear Christians and in honor of One who sits above, who does me so much good every hour that if I interpreted a thousand times as much and diligently, I would still not have deserved to live an hour or to have a healthy eye. It is all his grace and mercy that I am and have, yes, it is his precious blood and sour sweat, therefore (if God wills) everything should serve him in honor with joy and from the heart. If the Sudlers and papists blaspheme me, well then, the pious Christians, together with their Lord Christ, praise me, and I am all too richly rewarded if only a few Christians recognize me as a faithful worker. I ask nothing of papists; they are not worthy that they should recognize my work, and I should be sorry in my heart that they should praise me. Their blasphemy is my highest glory and honor; I want to be a doctor, even a full-fledged doctor, and they shall not take away my name until the last day, I know that for certain.**

But again I have not let the letters go too freely, but have taken great care, together with my helper, to see that, where a word is needed, I have kept it according to the letters, and have not gone away so freely. As John 6 [:27], where Christ

says: This one has been sealed by God the Father, it would probably have been better to say in German, this one has been marked by God the Father, or this one is meant by God the Father. But I would rather break away from the German language than from the word. Ah, interpreting is not the art of every man, as the mad saints think; it requires a heart that is pious, faithful, diligent, fearful, Christian, learned, experienced, and practiced; therefore I believe that no false Christian, nor a riotous spirit, can interpret faithfully, as it seems to have been done in the prophets at Worms, in which great diligence has indeed been done, and my German has almost been followed, but there have been Jews among them who have not shown great favor to Christ, otherwise there would have been art and diligence enough.

Let this be said of interpreting and the nature of languages. But now I have not only trusted and followed the manner of languages, that I have added Roman. 3 [:28] *Solum (alone)*, but the text and the opinion of St. Paul demand and enforce it by force. For there he deals with the main point of Christian doctrine, namely, **that we are justified by faith in Christ without all works of the law, and cuts off all works so purely that he also says that the works of the law (which is God's law and work) do not help to righteousness.** [Rom. 3:20]

And take the example of Abraham, that he was justified even without works, that even the highest work, which at that time was newly commanded by God, for and above all other laws and works, namely circumcision, did not help him to righteousness, but that he was justified by faith without circumcision and without all works. As he says, Rom. 4 [:2]: If Abraham was justified by works, he may boast, but not before God. But where all works are so purely cut off, there must be the meaning that faith alone justifies, and whoever wants to speak clearly and firmly of such a cutting off of works must say: **faith alone and not works make us righteous. This is forced by the matter itself apart from the language.**

Yes, they say, it is annoying and people learn from it that they must not do good works.

Beloved, what is there to chase, is it not much to be desired, that St. Paul himself does not say, faith alone, but pours it out more roughly, and knocks the bottom out of the barrel, and says, without the work of the law. And Gal. 2. not by the values of the law, and that rather in other places. For the word (faith alone) would still find a gloss, but the word (without the value of the law) is so coarse, vexatious, disgraceful, that no gloss can help. How much more might people learn from this to do no good work, since they hear preaching with such dry, strong words about the works themselves (no work, without work, not by work). Isn't it annoying that people preach (without works, no works, not by works)? Why then should it be offensive to preach this (faith alone)?

And what is even more annoying, St. Paul does not condemn evil common works, but the law itself. Someone might be even more annoyed by this and say that the law is condemned and cursed by God, and that we should hasten to do evil as they do. Rom. 3 [:8] Let us do evil that it may become good, as also a riotous spirit began to do in our day; shall we for the sake of such vexation deny St. Paul's word, or not speak fresh and free from the faith?

Beloved, St. Paul and we want to have this kind of disagreement, and for no other reason teach so strongly against works, and urge faith alone, than that people should fret and stumble and fall, so that they may learn and know that they will not become godly by their good works, but only through Christ's death and resurrection. Now if they cannot become godly by good works of the law, how much less will they become godly by evil works and without the law? Therefore it does not follow that good works do not help, but evil works do. Just as not finely follows: The sun cannot help the blind man to see, therefore night and darkness must help him to see.

But I am surprised that people are so reluctant in this public matter. Tell me whether Christ's death and resurrection is our work, which we do or not? It is not our work, nor is it some of the work of the law. Now Christ's death and resurrection alone makes us free from sin and pious, as Paul says in Rom. 4 [:25]: He died for

our sins and rose again for our righteousness. Tell me further, what is the work that we may grasp and hold Christ's death and resurrection? It does not have to be an outward work, but only faith in the heart. This alone, indeed alone without all works, grasps such death and resurrection where it is preached through the gospel.

Why, then, should people rage and fume, make heretics and burn, when the matter itself is basically clear and proves that faith alone can grasp Christ's death and resurrection without all works, and that this same death and resurrection is our life and righteousness? If, then, it is evident from Himself that faith alone brings, grasps and gives us such life and righteousness, why should we not speak thus? It is not heresy that faith alone grasps Christ and gives life, but it must be heresy whoever says or speaks this. Are they not mad, foolish and nonsensical? They confess the things to be right, and yet punish the talk of the same thing as wrong. Both right and wrong must be the same thing.

Nor am I alone, nor the first, in saying that faith alone justifies. Ambrose, Augustine and many others have said it before me, and whoever reads and understands St. Paul must be able to say this and cannot do otherwise: His words are so strong and suffer no, indeed, no work at all. If there is no work, it must be faith alone. Oh, what a fine, good, unpleasant doctrine it would be if people were to learn that, in addition to faith, they could also become pious through works, for it is much to say that not only does Christ's death take away our sin, but our works also do something for it. This would be honoring Christ's death so that our works could help him and do what he does, so that we would be as good and strong as he is. It is the devil who cannot leave the blood of Christ undefiled.

Because the matter itself requires that one should say: **Faith alone makes righteous**, and our German language, which also teaches this, has the example of the holy fathers for this, and also compels people's minds that they do not remain attached to works and lack faith and lose Christ, especially at this time, when they have been accustomed to works for so long, and

are to be torn from it with power, it is not only right, but also highly necessary, that one should say most clearly and completely that faith alone without works makes one pious. And I repent that I have not added to this, all and all. So without all the works of all laws, that it would be fully and completely expressed. Therefore it shall remain in my New Testament, and if all the papist asses become foolish, they shall not take it away from me.

That is enough of this now, I will speak of it further (if God gives grace) in the booklet *de Justificatione*.

## **To second question: Do the deceased saints pray for us?**

I will now answer this recently, for I intend to have a sermon on the dear angels, in which I will continue these pieces (God willing).

First of all, you know that in the papacy it is not only taught that the saints in heaven pray for us, which we cannot know because the Scriptures do not tell us this, but also that the saints have been made gods, that they must be our patrons, whom we should invoke, Some, too, who have never been, and have given each saint special power and authority, one over fire, this one over water, this one over pestilence, fever and all kinds of plagues, so that God himself had to be very weary and let the saints host and create in his place. The papists now feel or sense this abomination and secretly putting up their pipes, cleaning and adorning themselves with the intercessions of the saints. I will postpone this now, but what does it matter if I forget it and let such cleaning and adorning go unpunished?

Second, you know that God never commanded angels or saints to intercede. Nor is there any example of this in Scripture, for we find that the dear angels spoke to the fathers and prophets. But none of them was ever asked for intercession,

nor did the patriarch Jacob ask his angel of war for intercession, but took the blessing from him alone [[Gen. 32:24-29](#)]. But one finds the counterplay in Revelation (*Apocalypse*), where the angel did not want to be worshipped by John [[Rev. 22:9](#)]. And so we find that the service of the saints is a mere human act and a founding of its own apart from God's Word and the Scriptures.

But because it is not proper for us to intercede in worship without God's command, and whoever does so is tempting God, it is neither to be advised nor to be suffered to call upon the departed saints for intercession, or to teach them to do so, but rather to condemn them and teach them to avoid it. For this reason, I do not want to advise it, nor burden my conscience with other people's misdeeds. It has become so sour for me that I have torn myself away from the saints, for I have been deeply immersed and drowned in it beyond all measure. But the light of the Gospel is now so bright in the daytime that no one is excused from now on if he remains in darkness. We almost all know well what we should do.

Beyond this, it is an annual, annoying service to Himself that people easily become accustomed to turning away from Christ, and soon learn to place more trust in the saints than in Christ Himself. For without this, nature is all too prone to flee from God and Christ and to trust in men. Indeed, it becomes exceedingly difficult for us to learn to trust in God and Christ, just as we have vowed and owe. For this reason, we should not tolerate such a rebellion, so that the weak and carnal people may commit idolatry against the first commandment and against our Baptism. One can only confidently drive the confidence and trust from the saints to Christ, both with doctrines and practice. Nevertheless, it is hard and difficult enough to come to him and take hold of him. One must not paint the devil on the door, he will find himself.

Finally, we are sure that God is not angry with us because of this, and we are sure that we do not appeal to the saints for intercession, because he has not commanded us anywhere, for he says that he is a zealot who visits iniquity on those who do not keep his commandment. But there is no commandment here, so there is no wrath to fear. Because here on this side there is safety, and there great peril and vexation against God's Word, why should we turn from safety

into peril, since we have no Word of God to keep, comfort or save us in trouble? For it is written that he who willingly goes into danger will perish in it. God's commandment also says: You shall not tempt the Lord your God.

Yes, they say, you are condemning the whole of Christendom, which has held such things everywhere up to now? Answer: I know very well that the priests [*Pfaffen*] and monks seek such a cover for their abominations and want to blame Christendom for what they have neglected. So that when we say that Christendom does not err, we should also say that they do not err either, and thus no lies or error may be punished against them, because Christendom holds it so. So I then no pilgrimage (how evidently the devil is there), no indulgence (how gross the lies are), is unjust, in short, vain holiness is there. This strange thing they therefore mix, that they may lead us from this thing. We are now dealing with God's Word; what Christianity is or does belongs in another place. What is or is not the Word of God? What is not God's Word does not make Christianity.

We read at the time of Elijah the prophet that there was no word of God nor worship in public among all the people of Israel, as he says, Lord, they have killed your prophets and dug up your altar, and I am all alone [*1 Kings 19:10, 14*]. Here King Ahab and others will have said: Elijah, with such talk thou condemnest all the people of God. But God would have kept seven thousand all the same [*1 Kings 19:18*]. Do you not think that God could have kept His own under the papacy, even though the clergy and monks in Christendom have become vain teachers of the devil and have gone to hell? Many children and young people have died in Christ, for Christ, under his antichrist, has forcibly preserved baptism, the plain text of the Gospel in the pulpit, the Lord's Prayer and the faith, so that he might preserve many of his Christians, and thus his Christendom, and has said nothing of this to the devil's teachers.

And even though Christians have committed some of the papal abominations, the papacy has not yet proved that Christians have done so willingly. Much less does it prove that Christians have done right;

Christians can indeed err and sin, all of them, but God has taught them all to pray for forgiveness of sins in the Lord's Prayer. And has forgiven their sins, which they had to commit unwillingly, ignorantly and forced by the Antichrist, and yet the priests and monks do not say anything about it. But it can be proved that all over the world there has always been a great secret grumbling and complaining against the clergy, as if they were not dealing properly with Christianity, and the popes have resisted such grumbling with fire and sword until this time. Such mummering proves how gladly the Christians saw such abominations and how rightly they were treated. Yes, dear papists, come here now and say that it is the doctrine of Christendom what you have forged, lied and imposed on dear Christendom by force as the villains and traitors, and as the arch-murderers, murdered many Christians over it. Yet all the letters in all the papal laws testify that nothing of the will and counsel of Christendom has ever been taught, but vain "we teach and strictly command" (*districte praecipiendo mandamus*) is there, that their Holy Spirit is nourished. Such tyranny has Christendom had to suffer, so that the sacrament is robbed from her and kept in prison through no fault of her own. And the asses wanted to sell themselves and the painful tyranny of their iniquity to us now as a willing act and example of Christianity, and thus preen themselves, but this is getting too long now. Enough for now on the question, more another time, Pardon my long writing. Christ, our Lord, be with us all. Amen.

From the desert on Sept. 8  
(Ex Eremita octava Sept. )  
1530 (Anno M. D. XXX. )

**Martin Luther.**

Your good friend.



Justus Naumann's Publishing (Heinrich Naumann) in  
Dresden has published:

# **Dr. Martin Luther's Selected Writings for the German Christian People.**

8° broch. in 46 deliveries à 3 Ngr.

The content is as follows:

The 95 Theses. Sermon on indulgences and grace. Freedom of the Sermon on Indulgence and Grace. Letter to Dr. Staupitz. Sermon on the Sacrament of Penance. Interpretation of the Penitential Psalms. Interpretation of the Lord's Prayer. Interpretation of the 110th Psalm. Sermon on the marital state. Sermon on preparation for death. Sermon on usury. Sermon on the Blessed Sacrament and on fraternities. The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians, interpreted by Luther in Latin in 1519, Germanized in 1525. Letter to Pope Leo X. On the freedom of a Christian. Booklet of consolation to Prince Frederick. Of two kinds of justice. Sermon on good works. Of the Papacy at Rome, against the Romanist at Leipzig. Sermon on the ban. To the Christian nobility of the German nation. Sermon on the New Testament, i.e. on the Holy Mass. Of the new corner bulls and lies. Against the Bull of Antichrist. Why the Pope and his disciples burned books by Dr. M. Luther. Of the Babylonian Prison of the Church. The Diet of Worms. Church Postil. Evangelical salvation. Church Postil. Epistle part. Eight sermons, preached at Wittenberg in Lent. Faithful admonition to all Christians to beware of rebellion and indignation. On secular authorities and the extent of obedience owed to them. On the order of worship in the congregation. The little book of exchange. Ways of holding Christian mass and going to the table of God. Order of a common box. Reason and cause from Scripture that a Christian assembly or congregation has the right and power to judge all doctrine and to appoint, install and dismiss teachers. Epistle to the council and congregation of the city of Prague on how to choose and appoint church ministers. Sermon on the worthy reception of the holy, true body of Christ, etc. Sermon on the Gospel on the first Sunday after Easter, Quasimodogeniti etc. Dr. Martin Luther's controversial writings against Hieronymus Emser: Preface, Dr. Martin Luther's reply to Bock Emser. Dr. Martin Luther's reply to the super-Christian, super-spiritual and super-artificial book of Bock Emser at Leipzig, together with an appendix to Murnar, his journeyman. Dr. Martin Luther's writing on the abuse of the mass, to the Augustinians at Wittenberg. Preliminary report. Dr. Martin Luther's interpretation of the first epistle of St. Peter's Anno 1523. The writing to the councilors of all the cities of Germany, that they should establish and maintain Christian schools, dated 1524. Exhortation to peace on the twelve articles of the peasantry in Swabia, dated

1525. Dr. Martin Luther's reply to Erasmus of Rotterdam, that free will is nothing. Germanized by Justus Jonas. Anno 1526. table speeches. (Contents: Of the Word of God No. 1-8 Of God's Works and Providence No. 29-47. Of the Lord Christ No. 48-54. Of the Holy Spirit No. 55. Of Sin No. 56-66. Of Free Will and Faith No. 67 and 68. Of the Holy Catechism No. 69-72. Catechism No. 69-72. Of the Law and the Gospel No. 73-81. Of Faith and its Fruits No. 82-92. Of Prayer No. 93-102. Of the Christian Church No. 103. Of the Ministry of Preaching No. 104-127. Of Human Sciences and Arts No. 128-135. Of Temptations and Consolations No. 136-149. On right worship No. 150-152. On the state of marriage and the discipline of children No. 153-172. On authority No. 173-184. Various histories, mostly of contemporaries and contemporary events No. 185-200. On death and eternal life No. 201-212.) Dr. Martin Luther's spiritual songs 1524-1545.

The following were printed in particular:

## **Church newsletter**

for the German Protestant people.

First volume: Sermons on the **Gospels** (80 sheets) 1 Thlr. 15 Ngr. Second volume: Sermons on the **Epistles** (53 sheets) 1 Thlr. 6 Ngr.

Interpretation of the first epistle of St. Peter.

(10 sheets) 6 Ngr.

## **Reply to Erasmus of Rotterdam:**

**That free will is nothing.**

Germanized by Justus Jonas.

(21 Doge) 15 Ngr.

## **Table Talks.**

Selection. (9 sheets) 6 Ngr.

**Spiritual songs  
with historical introduction.**

(5 sheets) 4 Ngr.

Other writings are also sold individually, as far as stocks permit.

**Small postil**  
on selected texts  
from the **Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles**  
**according to the Saxon Church Book**

third volume.

For

Reading aloud in prayer meetings and home  
devotions

from

A. H. Rühle,  
pastor of Lausa with Hermsdorf.

Price broch. 1 Thlr.

Previously published by the same author:

**Small postil**  
on the evangelical pericopes.  
For reading aloud in prayer meetings and home  
devotions.  
2nd edition Price broch. 1 Thlr.

**Small postil**  
on the epistolary pericopes.  
For reading aloud in prayer meetings and home  
devotions.  
2nd edition Price broch. 1 Thlr.

**The cross of the Lord.**  
**On consolation and teaching**  
by  
Wilhelm Kühn,  
Seminary Director.  
Price brochirt 7½ Ngr.  
Finely bound with gilt edge. 17½ Ngr.



# Dr. Martin Luther's Church Postils.

Published by  
**Friedrich Francke,**